JPRS 77244

26 January 1981

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1845

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS 77244

26 January 1981

EAST EUROPE REPORT

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1845

CONTENTS

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Bilak's Statement on Anniversary of 'Lessons'
(Vasil Bilak; RUDE PRAVO, 20 Dec 80) 1

POLAND

Polish Journalist Analyzes State-Catholic Church Relations
(Stefan Kisielewski; EUROPAEISCHE RUNDSCHAU, No 4, 1980) 10

'POLITYKA' Editor Comments on Poland's Future
(Mieczyslaw Rakowski; LE POINT, 6 Oct 80) 19

Soviet Intervention in Poland Discussed
(Bernard Poulet; LE MATIN, 22 Oct 80) 21

Norwegian Trade Union Body To Contact Solidarity
(Trygve Wyller; AFTENPOSTEN, 14 Nov 80) 24

Briefs
Swedish Invitation to Solidarity 25

ROMANIA

Speech of Patriarch at Socialist Democracy and Unity Front Congress
(Constantin Stanulet; BISERICA ORTODOXA ROMANA, Jan-Feb 80) 26

Report on Speech of Bishop at World Council of Churches Meeting
(Antonie Plamadeala; BISERICA ORTODOXA ROMANA, Jan-Feb 80) 32

Eminescu Defended Against Charges of Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism
(Pompiliu Marcea; ROMANIA LITERARA, 11 Dec 80) 47

Contraception, Sterility Problems Handled by Bucharest Center
(Liviu Timbus; FLACARA, 25 Dec 80) 53

YUGOSLAVIA

Editorial Notes 'Passiveness' in LCY Despite Large Membership
(BORBA, 19 Dec 80) 55

Briefs
LCY Elections 57
Arrest of Plant Directors 57
Ouster of Institute Heads 58

BILAK'S STATEMENT ON ANNIVERSARY OF 'LESSONS'

Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 20 Dec 80 p 2

[Article by Vasil Bilak, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and CPCZ Central Committee secretary]

[Text] The 10 years which have elapsed since the adoption of the "Lessons from the Crisis Development in Our Party and Society after the 13th CPCZ Congress," have fully confirmed the significance and timeliness of this theoretical, political and historical document for our party and society, as well as for the international communist and workers' movement. Its significance has grown rather than diminished with the passage of time. The truthful, factual and timely character of the document is constantly reconfirmed by time and newly acquired experiences.

Based on a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of developments in Czechoslovakia during the second half of the 1960's, our party truthfully exposed the causes and nature of the crisis into which our party and society had sunk, and pointed out ways of overcoming this crisis and of guaranteeing further successful socialist development in our homeland.

Enemies of socialism were abetting the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia and were literally delighted with them. When their plans to change our socialist system failed, they began presenting--and are doing so to this day--this development as a debacle of socialism. Even our friends were asking how it was possible that after so many years of socialist construction, antisocialist and counterrevolutionary forces were able to organize themselves and actually go on the offensive. Czechoslovak communists considered it their international duty to answer the question of how our party could have ultimately permitted such a profound crisis as that which occurred in the late 1960's in our party and society, a party which in the past had successfully organized the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie, against fascism and for national liberation and state sovereignty, a party which was able to gain the confidence and esteem of workers, peasants and the intelligentsia in the struggle for working class power, a party which in a historically short period was able to build the foundations of socialism and restructure a fragmented agriculture toward socialist mass production.

To build the new is more complicated than to do away with the old. The old has become obsolete, is dying out, but the struggle for the new is difficult and it is not easy to gain confidence and appreciation for it. It is, as Valdimir Ilich Lenin reminded us, a whole historical epoch. Until such time as the

passage from capitalism to socialism has been completed not only in a few but in most countries, there will continue to be attempts to restore the old, obsolete, order. Resistance by the bouregoisie does not end with the assumption of power by the workers' class and the working people.

Countries which embark on the road of building socialism must expect that, even after the victory of the workers' class, after assumption of power, and even after the foundations of socialism have been laid, there will still be remnants of the defeated Bourgeoisie, the petit-bourgeois strata and other formerly privileged groups which are closely linked with the past and which do not easily relinquish their privileges, or immediately identify with the new reality.

Even during the time of the pre-Munich republic, Czechoslovakia represented an economically developed state which was politically polarized and divided. The big and small bourgeoisie, as well as the privileged state apparat, constituted a sizable and powerful population strata. Former owners of industrial enterprises, banks, large landowners and big businessmen did not reconcile themselves to the nationalization of their properties. If not they themselves, their children and grandchildren live among us in a socialist society. Many have adapted to the new reality, but a certain portion has for a long time refused to accept the fact that they could no longer enjoy their class privileges. While they are not badly off under socialism, their class blindness and feeling of superiority prevents them from identifying with socialism and from admitting that the management of state affairs had passed into the hands of the working people. Moreover, even among the workers and peasants there survives an ideology in which they had been indoctrinated for centuries and which still exerts influence, even though it is in conflict with their own interests.

The efforts of the internal and external enemies to reverse the social order in the socialist countries are nothing new. The capitalist world had never reconciled itself to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the birth of the first country of the Soviets. Capitalism did all in its power to destroy, throttle or at least weaken the young Soviet state. Toward this aim it mobilized all its material and spiritual resources, unleashed military intervention, economic blockade and discrimination, and created the breeding ground for fascism which tried to defeat the Soviet Union by force of arms. It chose the strategy of scorched earth in order to destroy as much of the material and cultural values as possible, massacre millions of people and thus set Soviet development back by decades. Despite all the cruelty, intrigue and treachery, Lenin's country lives and is developing successfully, while its strength and international authority have grown immensely and its attractiveness has multiplied.

The fact that imperialism had failed in its machinations is not due to lack of effort, but a demonstration of the strength of the new world which is being born. The ancient struggle between labor and capital, progress and reaction, is concentrated today mainly in the struggle between real socialism and imperialism. Other countries which have embarked on the road of building socialism are equally exposed to the insidious attack of imperialism.

In the interest of preserving its class domination, the old bourgeoisie and its world spare no effort to weaken our road to socialism through various methods and all available means which it adapts and changes according to the situation.

Not always does it incite to open revolt. It blackens and slanders socialism, while embellishing capitalism. As stated at the 15th Session of the CPCZ Central Committee, "Bourgeois ideology twists and turns upside down all values and concepts. Counterrevolution is presented as revolution, and manipulation and terrorizing of public opinion as freedom of the press. While from time to time in a pharisaic fashion it criticizes the fascist regimes and their Pinochets and Somozas, capitalism keeps them alive and places them squarely within its democratic world."

It is typical for bourgeois political ideology not to formulate its goals openly. Its hypocrisy and insidiousness lie in the fact that it dissimulates its true intentions. Socialism has become so attractive throughout the world that imperialism, as a rule, does not attack it openly. Overtly, it pretends to advocate improvement of socialism, while in reality it seeks its liquidation, a change to its liking. Only naive people, however, can believe that the bourgeoisie is interested in the welfare of socialism. Even today we can see that bourgeois politicians and their cohorts from among various renegades, revisionists and rightist opportunists, masquerade as favoring improving socialism, rather than its dismemberment and destruction.

Many of those who did not immediately grasp the truth of "Lessons" in all its depth, gradually discovered that under the demagogic slogans of freedom, democracy, socialism and care for the workers' class, lurked imperialist intentions to destroy socialism and deprive the workers of their true rights and freedom.

Some of the proponents and organizers of the "revival of socialism" themselves helped to demonstrate the truth. Some ended up directly in the embrace of the most reactionary forces of the bourgeoisie, others in the services of West German revanchists, while some were placed under the protective wing of rightist social democrats and socialists. Today these renegades are serving the bourgeoisie in its battle against socialism and the international communist and workers' movement. They cannot conceal their treason even by the most lofty pronouncements. This is the sad and inevitable end of those who, for 30 pieces of silver, betrayed the struggle of their ancestors and the blood spilled in the name of socialism and progress.

Every realistically thinking Czechoslovak citizen has come to understand that the various "revivalists" did not strive to improve socialism in Czechoslovakia, but rather to turn it back. They camouflaged their antisocialist and anti-Soviet intentions behind a facade of slogans about a "new model of socialism," about "democratic socialism," and "socialism with a human face." Only in this manner were they able to deceive and seduce the less-experienced and trusting people. Many of them are demonstrating today how long they had prepared for a counterrevolutionary turn of the situation in Czechoslovakia.

The enemies of socialism rely--and this figures prominently in their calculations--on the fact that the socialist system is still young and that it can still be weakened and deformed.

The fact that these enemies are striving for a change in the balance of power and the liquidation of socialism, is periodically admitted even by their employers. According to the TIMES of London of 28 October 1980, the principal interest in the West must be a change in the existing situation in Europe.

Socialism has resolved many problems and provided answers which were fought for by generations of revolutionaries. However, as emphasized by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, "The contemporary socialist world with its successes and perspectives, and with all its problems, is still a young, growing social organism in which not everything is yet firmly resolved, much still bears traces of past historical epochs. The whole socialist world is in motion and is constantly improving itself."

The world of socialism eliminated economic crises, social uncertainties, nationalist hatred, race and religious discrimination and the jungle laws of exploitation and oppression. It has not yet been able to eliminate all shortcomings. We are only in the process of building developed socialism. On this complicated, often controversial, road, as stressed in "Lessons," there have been mistakes and even tragic errors. The party itself exposed these and offered initiatives to overcome their causes. The antisocialist, revisionist and rightist opportunist groups misuse the self-critical approach of the party and have launched an attack against the very foundations of socialism. They cast doubt upon the historic role of the workers' class, attack its unity, slander the entire history of the CPCZ and its leading role in a socialist society, weaken the socialist state and attack our alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. They dust off old theories of "democratic socialism," yet again revive anticommunism, anti-Sovietism, nationalism and even abuse religious feelings among certain strata of the population. They brazenly present all this as a creative development of Marxism-Leninism under new conditions.

Certain representatives of the defeated bourgeoisie returned on the scene in 1968. A segment of the petty bourgeoisie which, after the victory of the working people in February 1948, quickly adapted itself to the new situation, began to atone for their sins of having helped socialism, and confessed their hatred of the new order which they had been concealing for so long.

Today only those who bear the brunt of responsibility for having prepared the counterrevolution deny that Czechoslovakia in 1968 was on the brink of civil war. Only thanks to the timely internationalist assistance of the fraternal countries was it possible to avert bloodshed in a fratricidal war. The internationalist assistance created conditions for the Marxist-Leninist forces in the party to reform. The election of Comrade Gustav Husak to the leadership of the Central Committee in April and the adoption of the Implementation Directive in May 1969, the cleansing of the party of revisionist and rightist opportunist forces and those who in the critical period failed the party and wavered, contributed to the restoration to party unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and the strengthening of the party's leading role and its close ties with the people.

What happened in Czechoslovakia is nothing mysterious or difficult to understand. It need not have happened had the party consistently adhered to Leninist principles of party life and had it constantly strengthened its ties with the people. Every weakening of party activity, any deviation from the principled Leninist approach, leads to ideological disarmament, to subjectivism and voluntarism, and to the growth of revisionism and rightist opportunism. This creates room for the upsurge of the reactionary forces at home and their linkage with the class enemy abroad.

The very fact that socialism, as opposed to capitalism, is progressive and just, does not automatically make it invulnerable to various erroneous tendencies. History provides ample illustration of this fact. The replacement of feudalism by capitalism was unquestionably a great historical and progressive event which no one today will deny. And yet it was an exchange of one social and economic system for another also based on private ownership of production means, on exploitation and oppression. Nevertheless, feudalism for centuries resisted, defended itself, and mounted various counterattacks only to preserve its privileges. It was often assisted in this by the very forces which should have fought against it.

There is ample historical evidence that the bourgeoisie also does not voluntarily abandon its class rule. From its class point of view, this is understandable. However, the laws of historical development act objectively and they will prevail throughout the world even if it takes whole generations to pass. The socialist societal order will succeed the capitalist society.

The building of socialism is a long-term, complicated and often controversial, process. The new social order must resolve in a principled manner new tasks with which no one in the past had been confronted. Socialism did not grow in capitalism's womb, but it is built by people who still carry with them traces of the old society. Nevertheless, unscientific ideology and petty bourgeois psychology and morality are becoming obsolete. Socialist construction must overcome old customs and traditions which resist the new, the revolutionary, and wage a determined struggle against inertia and, above all, against the intrigues of imperialism and counterrevolutionary forces. Figuratively stated, socialist construction is being implemented directly under fire of the class enemy. Errors and shortcomings can and do occur on this road. However, what is important, as often stressed by V. I. Lenin, is to understand in time the causes of the errors, to be able to learn from them and never forget these lessons.

We have learned from mistakes in the past. We have undertaken an extensive analysis of the causes which led to the profound crisis in our party and society in the second half of the 1960's. The document adopted by our party 10 years ago, "Lessons from the Crisis Development in our Party and Society after the 13th Congress," has lost none of its timeliness even today. It is for this reason that we are returning to it and will continue to do so.

As experience shows, not only ourselves, but imperialism, the anticommunist centrals, and counterrevolutionary forces have also managed to learn from their defeat. They now try to utilize a broader base, mask in a more refined manner their antipopular and antisocialist intentions, and coordinate their approaches better than before. The Polish events are also a revealing example of this. While methods, approaches and slogans change, the goals remain the same. Every revolutionary party, governed by a scientific world outlook, must respect various historical, cultural and economic specifics of its country. However, it is important not to retreat from basic, universally valid principles of socialist construction.

The building of a developed socialist society places great demands on the party and its leadership, on the socialist political system, on the state, and on each and every communist. The more demanding the tasks society sets for itself, the

more important is the subjective factor. The leading role of the party in the building of socialism is irreplaceable. Only a party relying on Marxist-Leninist teaching can remain at the head and lead the workers class and the working people, correctly regulate, plan and, even on the march, adjust the plans of socialist construction. Today, more than ever in the past, it is valid to say that, in order to fulfill its historic mission of being the leading force in society, the party must be united, ever ready for action, and have close ties with the people. To protect and strengthen party unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and intensify its ties with the people, constitutes the primary task of the entire party and of each and every communist. The party, as a living organism which constantly changes and rejuvenates itself, must strive to intensify its unity, to gain confidence, and to develop all facets of its internal life.

"A socialist society," as stressed at the 15th Session of the Central Committee, "cannot do without scientific theory which paves the way to practical application, and insures a strictly scientific approach to economic and cultural management. If we wish to go forward, if we wish to develop socialism successfully, we must recognize that, for a party fulfilling the avant garde role in society, there is no task more important than to develop and consistently apply the theory of Marxism-Leninism. It is not enough to talk about the role of theory and ideology, we must creatively apply them in practice in everyday life." Only based on profound true knowledge of the realities is it possible to elaborate a realistic program of future development, a program which is responsive to the wishes and hopes of the broadest strata of the working people, a program which people would accept as their own and which they would bring to life through dedicated work.

Our work was not finished with the adoption of "Lessons," it has only begun. It was necessary to make the conclusions of this document penetrate the consciousness of the people. It is no secret that there were--and still are--efforts to forget "Lessons" and replace it with various theories designed to pacify the party and the socialist state. The "blue skies" theory has been and remains enticing for some people ("the sun is shining, the skies are blue, we can rest peacefully and forget the past"). Carefree attitudes and self-satisfaction would mean the beginning of the end. That too we have already lived through. Irreplaceable support was accorded to "Lessons" by the resolutions of the 14th and 15th CPCZ congresses which endorsed the document and confirmed its validity.

Elaboration and approval of programs and correct resolutions is only the beginning of successful performance. The struggle for their implementation poses much more exacting tasks and demands great effort. It is nothing new to say that even the best resolutions and decisions are being implemented very slowly, half-heartedly and insufficiently, and that their fulfillment is encountering various obstacles.

Communists in every sector must wage a tireless struggle for the implementation of party resolutions and for the fulfillment of everyday tasks. Excuses citing objective problems and various difficulties cannot replace concrete deeds. The Central Committee, its organs, the kraj and okres committees, and basic organizations, having learned by experience of the past, devote much attention to ideological education and mass political work. Insufficient ideological work, as emphasized in "Lessons," was one of the basic causes of the weakening of the

party and its ties with the people, one of the basic sources of opportunities for revisionist tendencies.

It was not by accident that the 15th Session of the Central Committee devoted so much attention to the problems of ideological education and mass political work. The session emphasized that the strengthening of the leading role of the party, its readiness for action and the degree of influence exerted by party organizations, is directly dependent on the level of ideological orientation and theoretical preparedness of communists.

The work has improved in this sphere as well. As stressed by Comrade Husak at the 18th Session of the Central Committee, "We must intensify ideological orientation, educational and mass political work, strive to make sure that our truth penetrates all strata of our society and that, through convincing arguments, we win the hearts and minds of all honest citizens."

Development of Marxist-Leninist education means waging a struggle for a new socialist man, and to constantly combat various bourgeois, petty bourgeois, revisionist and rightist opportunist theories. The defeat of the right and the departure of its exponents from political life does not mean that the struggle against revisionism and rightist opportunism had ended. This struggle is not a one-time affair. Revisionism and opportunism are like weeds. No sooner do you pull them out, than they appear again.

Revisionism and opportunism are parasites of errors and shortcomings which are not resolved in time and which accumulate. Whenever the class struggle grows sharper, the activity of revisionism also grows. Unprincipled approaches, liberalism and apathy, should have no place in our life, i.e., in ideological education.

The crisis in the party and society in the late 1960's, and the assault of the counterrevolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia, were not isolated phenomena. They also had their foreign political aspects. The long-term preparation of the counterrevolution was born in the NATO staffs and anticommunist centrals. The counterrevolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia acted in close coordination with these centrals. The latter's struggle against socialism included attacks on the CSSR foreign policy orientation, especially our alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community.

The hostile centrals falsified and twisted historical experiences, and attacked the foreign policy of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union in order to destroy that which, for every real Czechoslovak patriot and internationalist, for every honest citizen of this republic, has been and continues to be a matter of both common sense and the heart, that which represents the cornerstone of our security, liberty and state sovereignty. The hostile centrals turned friends into enemies, patriots and internationalists into traitors, and rank nationalists and anti-Soviet elements into patriots and heroes.

Our party and society are not forgetting the years of the crisis and its causes. Relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have, since the April 1969 Central Committee session which elected Comrade Gustav Husak to lead the party, been steadily improving and have acquired a substantive and concrete content and character. During recent years these relations have achieved a new

quality in all spheres--political, economic, scientific, technological, diplomatic and military. More and more people understand that only through close mutual cooperation is it possible to implement bold programs and plans for the building of a developed socialist society.

Millions of people the world over are becoming convinced every day that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union in the contemporary class-divided world is a firm factor for peace and international cooperation. We in Czechoslovakia support this policy in every way because it reflects the vital interests of our nations and expresses the hopes and wishes of our people.

All attempts at an international isolation of Czechoslovakia have failed miserably thanks to the fact that we have again become a firm part of the world socialist community. Czechoslovakia today is an orderly state and its international authority is growing from year to year.

Our enemies hold it against us that we are following a principled, class-conscious, consistently anti-imperialist policy, and that we allow no room for internal and external subverters to carry on their political and ideological diversionary activity. Our policy expresses the interests of the people. We need not hide it, it is contained in all our party and state documents. It is a policy which our people approve and with which they identify.

The CPCZ has always considered--and still considers--relations with the Soviet Union and its communist party as the decisive criterion of socialist and proletarian internationalism. These relations for the Czechoslovak communist-patriot are a matter of honor and historical responsibility for socialism at home and throughout the world. The Soviet Union is our ally and friend, and the best guarantors of our security, our state sovereignty and liberty for our nations. From this stems our certainty, optimism and historical perspective.

The entry into the period of preparations for the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in the jubilee year of the 60th anniversary of its founding, obliges us to contribute through our daily labors to further strengthening of the unity of our party which was built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, to its readiness for action, and to its ever-stronger ties with the people.

We will develop and improve the political system, raise the quality of socialist democracy, strengthen the role of the socialist state, and constantly intensify our alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. Through conscientious work we want to contribute to the cause of socialism, to socialist progress and to peace in the world.

Bourgeois propaganda and various revisionists unceasingly confuse the public by fraudulent assertions that the policy of our party finds no support in the broad strata of our population, and that even after 10 years nothing has really changed. The results achieved in the building of a developed socialist society, however, attest to quite the contrary. These results are the fruits of dedicated labor of workers, peasants and the intelligentsia, who have accepted the program of the CPCZ as their own. Thanks to their selfless efforts, the period since the advent of a new Marxist-Leninist party leadership and since the adoption of "Lessons,"

has become one of the brightest chapters in the history of socialist construction in our homeland. This is convincing evidence that the Czechoslovak people fully support the policy of the party and that they are determined to build and defend the socialist system of our society.

The decade which has elapsed since the adoption of "Lessons," confirmed to the fullest extent the timeliness and validity of this document. Years have passed, time has healed many wounds, and new events have occupied the spotlight. Having benefited from the lessons of historical experience, however, we will continue to develop and defend socialism and multiply its values, so that our children, grandchildren and all future generations can be filled with a sense of pride in the work of their fathers and mothers, and so that they may continue to improve and creatively develop this heritage.

9496
CSO: 2400

POLISH JOURNALIST ANALYZES STATE-CATHOLIC CHURCH RELATIONS

Vienna EUROPAEISCHE RUNDSCHAU in German No 4, 1980 pp 47-57

[Article by Stefan Kisielewski: "The Church in Poland: Institution or Mission?"]

[Text] The Catholic Church in Poland and its history since 1945 have aroused interest abroad as a unique phenomenon, which may turn out to have set a precedent, however. An autonomous, non-Marxist institution, the traditional influence of which affects almost the entire population and which has for 35 years been active in a country dominated by totalitarian Communism--undoubtedly a phenomenon, even on a global scale. Thus it is not surprising that in the West, too, a great deal has been written on the problems concerning Church and state in Poland. Likewise, the present writer published a study on the postwar history of Polish Catholicism, its stormy ups and downs, its struggle and its personalities: "The Relations Between Church and State in Ethnic Poland" (published in Polish in the HISTORICAL JOURNALS of the Polish Literary Institute, Paris, No 49, 1979). This study in its entirety was incorporated--as a preface--in the omnibus volume "Nous Chretiens de la Pologne" [We Christians of Poland] (published in French and English; Paris, Cana, 1979). I would like to recommend another book on this subject by a Polish author that was likewise published abroad: Andrzej Micewski's "Katholische Gruppierungen in Polen" [Catholic Groups in Poland] (Munich, Kaiser-Gruenewald, 1978).

The interesting history of the Polish Church after World War II has been amply documented in the works of foreign authors (e.g. in Peter Raina's recent monograph on Cardinal Wyszynski that was published in various languages, et al.).

At present, however, nearly 2 years after the Krakow archbishop, Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, was elected Pope (16 October 1979), the Polish Church is entering a new stage--an unexpected stage that has not by any means been understood by the West. Thus the necessity to use new words, to try to come up with a new, unconventional diagnosis; for the world does not stand still, not even east of the Iron Curtain.

For many years (until 1956), the struggle of the Polish Communist Party was of a political, strongly ideological nature. This is understandable, considering the Church's open and matter-of-fact opposition to Stalinism--that since 1945 had been terrorizing Poland, turning it upside down--and the concomitant monopolistic ideological offensive of Marxism in the dogmatic form it had assumed at that time. At that time, the Party used to maintain that the Church was allied with the remains of the political opposition; in this approach, the Party demagogically exploited certain links (that had actually been discontinued during the German occupation)

between certain clerical circles and nationalist parties or parties of the conservative center that had been active in the prewar period.

Undesirable, But Indispensable

On the other hand, the Polish Church--a religious institution that also had always been closely linked with the Nation's history and that during the Polish partitions had been a symbol of national unity and identity--was indispensable for the people designing the new, communist Poland. Without the Church--so deeply rooted in the traditions of our people--it would have been impossible to settle millions of refugees from the East--people who were forcibly transferred from Wilno and Lwow, from Volhynia and Podole--in the (formerly German) regions on the Oder River and on the Baltic Sea. Without the support of the Church, it would have been impossible in the postwar turmoil to establish and consolidate credible foundations of Polish statehood. Thus the constant ambiguity in the attitude of Poland's communist state leadership toward the Church, the division of the clergymen into "good" and "bad" ones, the establishment of "Pax" and of the organization of the so-called "priest-patriots", both of which were used for purposes of diversion; thus the zigzag policy, acts of terror alternating with compromise agreements (1950), which were not painstakingly adhered to, however; thus the toleration of Catholic intellectual journals such as the Krakow weekly TYGODNIK POWSZECHNY and the monthly ZNAK (both reactivated after the upheaval of 1956 and allied with the Warsaw monthly WIEZ).

At the end, however, there were unequivocal acts of violence and terror vis-a-vis the Church, vis-a-vis priests and bishops and--in September 1953--the arrest and internment of the Primate of Poland, Stefan Wyszynski--an internment that lasted 3 years.

After 1956

1956 was the year of the--sufficiently discussed--upheaval. The Primate was released and religion returned--albeit only for a short time--to the schools. The Church resolutely supported the new Gomulka team by adopting a compromising attitude and forestalling an eruption such as occurred in Hungary. Perhaps one could say that during the period of the "thaw" the Polish Church in a way became an integral part of the system, especially after 1972, when upon ratification of the agreement between Gomulka and Willy Brandt (December 1970) the Pope officially recognized the Polish dioceses in the territories that formerly had belonged to Germany.

In a sense, this process of the Church's integration in the communist state system has been continuing up to the present, irrespective of all the friction, haggling and pressure. The pressure--originating from the Office for Religious Affairs--intensified in certain periods, assuming different forms: obstruction of religious instruction (which now was entrusted again to the churches), refusal to permit construction of new churches, imposition of stiff dues and taxes on the diocesan administrations, induction of theological seminary students to military service, restrictions on the activities of the Catholic University in Lublin [KUL], etc. From time to time, there were sharp attacks on the Primate and the Episcopate because of their alleged nationalism, conservatism and obscurantism. In 1965, for example, on account of the well-known letter by the Polish Episcopate to the German bishops, the state launched a rabid anti-Church campaign. Gomulka reached the peak

of irrational stubbornness in 1966, when he denied the Pope an entry permit for a visit to Czestochowa on the occasion of the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's Christianization. If he had known who would ascend St. Peter's throne in a few years.... For the time being, the state tried--in accordance with the motto divide et impera--to pit against the Primate the Krakow archbishop (since 1964) Karol Wojtyla who was being praised for his "progressiveness" in the sense of the Second Vatican Council.

However, regardless of these continuous maneuvers and skirmishes, it should be stated that after 1956 the Church has essentially stopped being a political opposition that in the communist system is portrayed as a force working "from the outside", in favor of hostile systems; rather, the Church has become an internal competition, with which the state had nolens volens made its peace. The state skillfully defused the purely political ambitions of certain Catholic circles by permitting the establishment of five clubs of the Catholic intelligentsia and subsequently, in 1957, by admitting to the Sejm (Polish Parliament) a small circle of Catholic deputies of the "Znak" group. In the parliament, this--in its own way independent--circle (for the most part, it originated from the Krakow group of TYGODNIK POWSZECHNY) performed the function of substitute representation of the Catholics--until 1976, when the Party practically--albeit not formally--put an end to this function.

Things grew increasingly quiet around the "Catholic opposition," all the more so, since the really political opposition began to crystallize in other quarters, namely within the circles and the apparatus of the ruling party itself--which in this system is considered to be more dangerous than even the most rebellious moods among the people.

The New Opposition

During the upheaval of 1956, the reformist-liberal group--that at that time was called "Pulawska" Group and that had not infrequently been inspired by old Marxist dogmatists who tried to rehabilitate themselves--had already played an important role. As Gomulka, who had been carried to power by this group, tightened the reins--as he did, for example, when he prohibited as early as 1957 the rebellious and truth-loving student paper POPROSTU--the dissatisfaction among the Party intelligentsia spread. Open conflict broke out in 1966, when the eminent young philosopher Leszek Kolakowski--at that time a man developing toward "revisionism"; at present, as an emigre, an emphatic anti-Marxist--was expelled from the Party.

Along with him, a group of writers left the Party and at the universities, there developed the movement that led to the famous and notorious events of March 1968. In that year, the opposition was strengthened by a large number of members of the intelligentsia, who were expelled from the Party, in many cases on charges of "Zionism"--an accusation that the growing, radical-nationalist, anti-intellectual wing of the Party made its key slogan. Some of these alleged "Zionists" emigrated abroad, but a large number of idealistic youths, who in 1968 had been badly wronged by party intrigues, joined the ranks of the student-intelligentsia opposition, which already was openly demanding democratization and freedom of thought and expression and which bluntly called the dictatorship just that.

Thus, at the beginning of the 1970's, there emerged in the country a new psychological and moral situation. The Church is no longer the classic oppositionist force. While it is ideologically sharply opposed to Marxism, it is weighed down by its legalism and by its institutional character; for this reason, it allows itself to be outdone in the criticism of the rulers by the elitist, but also popular youth groups. And these youth groups are no longer made up of the descendants of the disillusioned Marxists. New patriotic-independent movements have entered the scene--movements such as the trail-blazing lay "Ruch" (Movement) Group that during the period from 1968 to 1970 proclaimed its program of national restoration, for which its organizers had to pay with a few years of incarceration. Thus the epoch of the Catholic opposition "monopoly" is coming to an end in Poland. However, to understand this more clearly, one must point out what constitutes the mechanism of mental subjugation in the Marxist system.

Generally speaking, this mechanism consists of the monopoly of ideology and information, which is implemented by the all-powerful active and passive censorship. Everything is censored--the media, the schools and universities, books, and above all history and politics. By means of selection of the information provided, through interpretation of historical facts and selection of facts, perceptions and slogans, the state creates a new psychological quality and forms a new type of man, whose susceptibilities are purged of unnecessary elements and shielded by an imposed state of ignorance, thus allowing the state freely to imprint the Marxist world view in its Moscow version.

The people resist this unremitting offensive of all-encompassing propaganda, but they have at their disposal only very few fighting instruments. The numerically insignificant Catholic press either is politically subservient to the goals of the Party (the "Pax" press) or it is totally purged by the preventive censorship of all ideas and reports that do not conform with the general line of indoctrination. The most painful element is the truly Orwellian revision of recent history; from history--and from political-historical literature as well--entire periods have been eliminated. The great figure of Pilsudski, the creator of an independent Poland in our century, was either totally liquidated or distorted--a treatment meted out as well to opponents of Pilsudski such as Dmowski and Witos. The history of the Polish Communists who had been killed by Stalin was likewise falsified. The course of World War II has been totally changed: Gone is the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact; gone are the fourth partition of Poland, the deportation of 1.5 million Poles to Russia, the Katyn mass murder, the causes of the lonely defeat of the Warsaw Uprising, the Stalinist acts of violence after the war, the 20th CPSU Congress and Khrushchev's secret speech. Our recent history has been utterly distorted; our national memory has been obliterated--and a nation without memory loses its identity. It becomes a will-less victim of the monopoly of political information held by the rulers. Without knowledge and consciousness, there cannot be any resistance, there is no possibility of defending oneself; man is transformed into a spineless puppet in the hands of the creators of the new conception of history, who are all-powerful since they can ex post facto change the past and eradicate in the heads of the people all traces of an inconvenient truth.

These were and still are the goals and methods of the mental subjugation in Poland both in the Stalin era and after the short liberal intermezzo of 1956. While the forms of that activity changed, the goals remained the same. And the only institutional means of offering mental resistance were in the hands of the Catholic Church.

To be sure, through efforts extending over many years, the secular organizations connected with the Church were reduced to a minimum; the Church was totally denied access to the media and to public life; it was locked up behind its church walls. However, in the sermons and rituals, the Church retained its own language, it retained its own traditional control over the mass of the faithful, over the simple Christian people who terrify the Marxists. And this specific language is not only religious; for 1,000 years, it has also been patriotic. For the entire postwar period, more precisely since 1948, the Primate, the "interrex," Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski was a symbol of the suppressed Polish patriotism; for a long time, he was the only voice unequivocally calling for freedom. For this reason, the Communists fought him bitterly; they called him a nationalist, a chauvinist, a conservative demagogue. This went on for many years, until in 1968 the situation began to change in a paradoxical fashion. A new enemy of the ideological monopoly system appeared on the "left"; demands for freedom were unexpectedly raised by laymen, indeed sometimes even in party circles! This was unprecedented!

Truce

The Communists do not at all like to be exposed to cross fire. Consequently, when in 1971 the pragmatic and—in practical matters—flexible Gierek team came into power, the Communists concluded a truce with Wyszynski, which, incidentally, has so far been honored only by one side.

The sin of having been a leader of the people was forgiven and forgotten; indeed, he was actually praised! After all, national slogans and the language of patriotism are nothing new to the Party, especially since it was precisely the Marxist intellectuals who under the leadership of Kolakowski were beginning to rebel. So they obviously are removed from the people, whereas Wyszynski is close to the people. Thus the new motto is: Wyszynski is a patriot; consequently, he and his Church are on our side, on the side of the party of the people! Today it is the revisionists, Trotskyites, Zionists, the false Marxists, the cosmopolites, etc., who are the principal enemy. There is only one enemy, not two, in the country!

It goes without saying that I have somewhat simplified matters. The Primate did not fall into the trap of the Party; naturally, one could say a great deal in this regard. It goes without saying that the "normal" reprisals and the pressure on the Church have never been discontinued, for totalitarianism does not change its strategic objectives. However, it is a fact that since 1973/74 the Communist Party has been pinning its hopes on Wyszynski, that it has ostentatiously been showering him with praise and has tried--through his good offices (or over his head)--to reach an agreement with Rome, with the Pope, even to conclude a concordat with him. A concordat with a communist country—what a success for both sides! Rome—it was rumored at that time--is in favor of this, and secret talks are being conducted; since 1971, Warsaw has repeatedly been visited by the papal diplomats Casaroli and Poggi; in 1974, Pope Paul VI granted an audience to the Polish foreign minister, Olszowski. In the same year, a special Polish representative at the Vatican was appointed--"for work contacts." Since 1975, secret trilateral consultations (Vatican--Primate--government) have been conducted; a triumph of a pragmatism unconcerned with ideology, for at the same time more and more permits are being granted for the construction of new churches in Poland. Does this mean that in the 1970's religion stopped being an "opium of the people" dangerous to the system?

The situation is not that simple! For in the 1970's the permits for new churches did not extend to the Przemysl diocese or...to the Krakow archdiocese. In the Przemysl diocese, the courageous and uncompromising Bishop Ignacy Tokarczuk and his flock of believers built in 10 years over 100 village churches without troubling about permits. And in the Krakow archdiocese, matters were even worse...Archbishop Wojtyla--a Cardinal since 1967--busied himself with organizational and educational work among the university and high school students (organizations of the "Light-Life" Movement, the so-called "Oases"); the university priests even staged lectures on totally secular subjects and in the archiepiscopal palace, there took place literary and historical symposia. And the most serious matter: The Krakow Archiepiscopal Curia established relations with secular opposition forces of various persuasions; in fact, it engaged in a dialog with rebel Marxists. In the view of the security agencies, this was a mortal sin: By no means allow the opposition, the enemy to join forces! And at this point there occurred a 180° turn. Cardinal Wojtyla was rebuked for what formerly had been praised: for his progressiveness, his modern attitude, his open-mindedness in the sense of the Second Vatican Council, his readiness to engage in a dialog. Cardinal Wyszynski, on the other hand, was praised for what formerly had been criticized: for his traditional, people-oriented Catholicism, for his patriotism. This is what is called dialectics! All the more so since both elements were deliberately played up, since they were mythologized in the excitable imagination of the tacticians/psychologists....

Dialectics in Practice

It would be difficult here to give an accurate description of the genealogy and development of the Polish secular opposition "outside legality" in the last few years. This opposition originated on the one hand from the initiative of the descendants of the old opposition parties that had represented the idea of Poland's independence and that had been crushed during the Stalin era and on the other hand from the activities of the disillusioned young people, who had grown up under the auspices of the Party and of Marxism, and thirdly—from the new, upcoming generation of the last decade that is yearning for historical and literary truth, for freedom and national identity. In 1976, after the strikes and workers' uprisings, the intellectual opposition and the opposition of the young people received support from the spontaneous--albeit sometimes diffuse and isolated--mass movements. There emerged the KOR organization (Committee for the Defense of the Workers) and subsequently the "Human and Civil Rights Defense Movement" (ROPCIO). The last organization created was the patriotic, youth-backed Young Poland Movement, which has its bases in the cities on the Baltic Sea. There were published more and more new pamphlets and books--initially mimeographed by "home-grown" means; subsequently distinguished by a more and more sophisticated makeup--that aimed at breaking the official information and censorship monopoly. The people organized lectures, patriotic demonstrations on anniversaries of truly national importance, and even hunger strikes--and then the police launched an insidious campaign of repression--insidious, because it was concealed from the population. It has been kept secret, because the youth movement is still somewhat elitist and restricted to certain university circles, and although the movement hopes to win over larger segments of the population (the workers, the village), the authorities still hope to be able to push it aside to an obscure periphery unknown to the public.

The plan to isolate the opposition, the attempt to portray it as a formation made up exclusively of the descendants of the old intra-party rebels (and the Party, even though its membership totals nearly 3 million, is not one of the most popular organizations, basing itself for the most part on careerists and opportunists) was organically linked with an operation that aimed at cutting off this opposition from the church institutions deeply rooted among the people—the only institutions that could serve as a broad sounding board for the nation as a whole. However, the opposition, which even now is distinguished by many facets and which comprises diverse views and nuances, seeks contact with the Church and relates to the Church its patriotic and democratic manifestations. Even the representatives and heirs of the former "lay Left" have recognized the liberal character of the Polish Church that by its nature is closely linked with the people; evidence of this is Adam Michnik's highly interesting book "The Church, the Left, the Dialog" (published in 1977 by the Polish Literary Institute, Paris).

Meanwhile, many priests and even some bishops became convinced that the Church must no longer be locked up in the parishes, that it must no longer wait for administrative privileges on the part of the state, that sermons and processions alone cannot counterbalance the information and conception monopoly threatening the nation's identity and dignity and even elementary common sense, that one must "go to the people," participate in public life, impart to this life an authentic and spontaneous character and oppose the coercive mendacity decreed by the state.

These tendencies coincided with a favorable social atmosphere, of which they became part: The dissatisfaction with the ominous economic situation of the country, the disgust with the fiction of elections and with the diverse obligatory "solidarity demonstrations", and the increasingly vociferous youth opposition. Starting at the beginning of the 1970's, all this contributed to that ferment and to the cultural-ideological movement led by clergymen. This movement comprises the youth organizations of the "Oases", which are active in devotional centers, study groups and summer camps, and a broad spectrum of academic lectures—organized by the university priests—on history, jurisprudence, political science and philosophy.

The concerned state authorities launched a large-scale--albeit secret--counter-campaign, especially since after 1976 the "Oasis" Movement attracted tens of thousands of young people, who appeared to be "endangered" by the rapprochement with the secular opposition. Since Cardinal Wojtyla was regarded as the movement's key advocate and supervisor within the Episcopate, he became the main target of the attacks launched by the Office for Religious Affairs, in contrast to the—now highly lauded--Primate. Again the old principle of divide et impera--applied all the more deliberately, the more apparent became in the Polish Party the development away from ideological Marxism and toward tactical pragmatism. And then there came the great surprise: Of all people, it was the Krakow Archbishop Wojtyla who in October 1978 was elected Pope!

The Papal Shock

The shock was great and it affected everyone. Now it was clear in whose hands the relations between State and Church in Poland would be resting. As soon as the initial shock had subsided, the Party decided graciously to accept the new state of affairs and flexibly to exploit all of the possibilities it perceived, especially in connection with the papal visit to Poland in June 1979.

This triumphant trip was a great jolt to the Polish public, a liberating, invigorating jolt; and this aspect was most skillfully exploited by the government. Incidentally, everyone in Poland expected something of this trip. The government hoped that by playing the role of the gracious host it would enhance its status vis-a-vis the Polish people and gain the sympathy and moral support of international public opinion--and it goes without saying that in this regard the government was assured of the Kremlin's approval. The Church hoped that through the intercession of the Pope it would finally gain access to the mass media, obtain greater freedom for its press and clarify its legal status. And the oppositionist young people hoped that in the course of the overall liberalization they, too, would be given more opportunities to expand their activities, to gain greater publicity and to obtain freedom from political reprisals.

Which Contestants Attained Their Objectives?

Which of the contestants attained their objectives and which turned out to have miscalculated their chances? It sounds paradoxical, but regardless of the overwhelming national and Catholic manifestation that the papal visit to Poland turned out to be, it was the government that derived the greatest benefit. Today, after a year has gone by, one can safely say that in terms of domestic affairs the papal visit was unproductive. There did not come about any authentic, legal Catholic political movement; as usual, only the three well-known Catholic puppet groups were admitted to the parliamentary elections in March 1980, and neither public opinion nor the Church reacted to this; neither called for reform in this area.

The Church did not and will not obtain anything--in spite of the sweet nothings that both sides felt they had to mouth for the sake of their prestige and in spite of certain administrative easements in practical matters (media, activities in the public sector). For the Party does not have anything more to offer: Even a partial waiver of the intellectual monopoly, the information and propaganda monopoly, would undermine the foundations of the system. Freedom is indivisible: One cannot give a little freedom to the Church without giving some freedom to the people as well, for Catholicism is too intimately bound up with the life of the people.

The situation of the illegal youth opposition that with the courage of despair is continuing its publishing, educational and propaganda work has not improved in the least. On the contrary, this opposition is being subjected to increasingly harsh police reprisals, which, incidentally, are skillfully concealed from the--thus insufficiently informed--international public. And the public in Poland gets to know of the activities of the opposition only through Radio Free Europe.

Indeed, a peculiar and unexpected situation, this psychological and political status quo in Poland after the papal election! To be sure, the Episcopate now negotiates directly with Rome--but this is done in secret, unbeknownst to Polish public opinion. The Church--seemingly strengthened and unassailable--is actually getting weaker. Such are the surprising effects of many a success: Not infrequently one is strengthened by defeats, whereas success narrows both hopes and perspective!

Above all, one now senses a weakening of the leading role of the Primate and of the influence of his individuality. To be sure, the pastoral letters of the Episcopate are emphatic and unequivocal, but in the everyday life of the Church, one notes an ambivalence, a split that goes right through the dioceses, through the comments of individual priests and bishops. The Polish Church is no longer a monolith.

The split affects above all the relations with the youth opposition, the attitude toward questions concerning the public interest, and the character and intensity of the mass operations transcending the framework of the parish. For example, the "Weeks of Christian Culture," which are officially staged in the dioceses, are quite different in nature: In some regions, they assume a national-historical and thus political and secular form; in other regions, they are purely theological and pastoral. It is as though the Episcopate and the clergy had split into two wings: One wing--institutionally and tactically oriented--is bent on forming an "alliance with the throne" so as to be able unimpededly to fulfill its pastoral and religious function--which, after all, would be quite a feat in a country ruled by Marxists. The advocates of this position have no faith in the--incidentally numerically insignificant--opposition and its objectives; they emphasize that the Church is on principle apolitical, that it pursues its own transcendental goals and that it could not work toward restoration of the--for many years nonexistent--political pluralism, which under the given circumstances would anyway be adventurism and a chimera.

The other wing--fervently engaged in oppositionist activism--harbors contrary moods. Many clergymen--both young and old ones--feel that the Church must not give up the uncompromising struggle for truth and public morality, the struggle for the nation's soul and identity, both of which are threatened by the state's totalitarian power. They hold that the Church must take the side of the people and of the young rebels, who are engaged in the lonely and heroic struggle against totalitarianism.

The balance between these two wings now tips toward one and now toward the other side. The oppositionist activists can boast of a number of positive results--one need only mention here the youth-inspired nationwide divine services and prayers on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Katyn massacre or the hunger strikes--backed by the priests--in St. Christopher's Church in Podkowa Lesna that were staged in protest against the arrest of Miroslaw Chojecki, the director of NOWA, an illegal publishing house. On the other hand, the "right wing" of the Episcopate dissociates itself from overly risky and secular national celebrations. The conflict continues to smolder--extraordinarily interesting and characteristic, even though it is for the most part concealed, camouflaged. For obvious reasons, the government fans this conflict as much as possible.

What Will the Future Bring?

Is the Polish Church--which is admired by the whole world for its unity and uncompromising attitude--in danger of losing its orientation after all these achievements? What will win out--diplomacy or candor, institutional legalism or spontaneous, politically committed enthusiasm? Will the decision possibly be made by the proven authority on Polish affairs, the head of global "Roman diplomacy" who today thinks along universal lines? The man who in Krakow was an uncompromising advocate of the rebellious youth, but who today is weighed down by his knowledge of the universal strategy and tactics of the secular powers of mankind?

An enigmatic and complex situation, more ambiguous now than during the era of open repression. At the moment that I am writing these words (June 1980), Archbishop Poggi is in Warsaw--a man who once was thought to be a typical representative of the Vatican's secret diplomacy, of the school of compromise. What role is he going to play now that the decision is in the hands of the Polish, the "Krakow" Pope?

And what line will finally be crystallizing--an institutional church that within the framework of legality--a rock in the surf--defies adversity or the apostolic church, the church of the catacombs fighting for its mission?

8760
CSO: 2300

'POLITYKA' EDITOR COMMENTS ON POLAND'S FUTURE

Paris LE POINT in French 6 Oct 80 pp 94-95

[Interview with Mieczyslaw Rakowski, editor of POLITYKA; time and place not given]

[Text] A representative of the liberal faction within the communist party, Mieczyslaw Rakowski, 53, analyzes Poland's prospects on the eve of the Central Committee plenum, of which he is one of the important members. He is also the editor in chief of the very influential weekly newspaper, POLITYKA.

LE POINT: One month after the signature of the Gdansk accords, is it possible for you to give us a status report?

Mieczyslaw Rakowski: The situation is still in a state of flux, which is understandable considering the depth of the crisis we have just gone through. Rulers and ruled are wondering about the country's future and are asking themselves how to adapt to the new structures.

[Question] What can we expect from the upcoming plenum of the Central Committee and from the extraordinary congress of the party?

[Answer] There is a bit of magic in all that. First and foremost we are going to try to draw upon our past experiences and then to determine the program for the next 5 years. Therefore, you can expect changes in personnel within the Central Committee. The plenum and congress should be a stabilization factor; however, we have to find a new stability.

[Question] Do you feel that the party is capable of renewing itself from the inside?

[Answer] The question is not one of knowing whether this is possible: it is necessary. Do not forget that when there is talk of social pressure, it is coming from every stratum of society: the Catholics and workers, but also from the party's rank and file.

[Question] We note, nevertheless, that there is an increasingly important separation between the party and the country.

[Answer] As a matter of fact, the ties between the party and society have been seriously attenuated; however, we cannot restore confidence in one month, not with a plenum and not with a congress, even if it is an extra-ordinary session. That is a slower process during which we must reconcile the autonomy of all categories of socioprofessionals, including the youth movements.

[Question] Can several trade union organizations coexist in Poland?

[Answer] I feel personally that we are moving in the direction of unity in the trade union movement. Consequently, there will be a struggle between worker organizations; and this rivalry is positive. This emulation factor can only be beneficial; however, if I were Lech Walesa's adviser, I would say to him: be careful that this does not go to your head.

[Question] As a journalist, how do you plan to resolve the problems of information?

[Answer] Four points seem essential to me: reduce the role of censorship; no longer consider the printed word as sacred; tell yourself that the most critical article will not overthrow the government; and accept the fact that journalists may engage in polemics.

[Question] Do you think that we can speak about a "Polish experience"?

[Answer] We do not wish to be lesson-givers, and the Poles are still students in the school of Marxism. We must first prove to the socialist countries and the Eurocommunists that we can make our way out of our difficulties by ourselves. However, for the moment, Poland does not have many reasons to be proud.

8143
CSO: 3100

SOVIET INTERVENTION IN POLAND DISCUSSED

Paris LE MATIN in French 22 Oct 80 p 10

[Article by Bernard Poulet]

[Text] The confusion now reigning in Poland is fueling the fears of a Soviet intervention. Lech Walesa very nearly was placed in the minority on Monday by those who wanted an immediate strike. However, he did manage to postpone the decision to the following week.

Nevertheless, the possibility of a Soviet power play is looked upon with a great deal of skepticism my many Poles, while the big Western countries already seem to have "resigned" themselves to the drama. It is not inevitable, as the announcement of the legalization of the Solidarity Trade Union effective Friday, which was made by the Warsaw court with jurisdiction, seems to demonstrate.

"Let them try, then!" shouted Lech Walesa Monday evening before the delegates of some 7 million members of the new Solidarity Trade Union, with reference to an invasion of Poland by "foreign" troops. "Often in the past we have been threatened with rifles and tanks, but we will not allow our faces to be smashed in," the union leader added in his forthright style.

All the foreigners who return from Poland were struck by the scant attention the workers seem to be paying to the threat of an intervention. This to the extent that Westerners often mention the "recklessness," the inevitable, suicidal "romanticism" of the Poles.

It is all the more surprising because the West seems increasingly convinced that a Soviet intervention is "inevitable." Even Edmund Muskie, American secretary of state, who said Sunday that in his opinion: "The Polish people cannot be insensitive to pressures from abroad, not only from the Soviet Union, but from other countries of the Eastern bloc."

Of course, the mouthing off by East German, Czechoslovak and even Romanian leaders, as well as Soviet military maneuvers on the Polish border, over the last several weeks are not very reassuring. However, should we interpret these signals as the announcement of the imminent drama?

The scenario can be read differently. First, we should ask ourselves what the price of the "Warsaw coup" would be for the USSR.

No matter who the next U.S. president may be, an operation in the style of Budapest 1966 or Prague 1968 would inevitably sign the death certificate of a certain detente. Even if the Western countries are not concealing the fact that they will be unable to stop another invasion, they will be forced to impose new sanctions. For an ailing Soviet economy, the price would be very high. All the more so because the Soviets in Warsaw will be condemned to assuming responsibility for a Polish economy that is already in trouble. Where will they find the money to absorb Poland's 20 billion [monetary unit not given] foreign debt at a time when just to maintain the current situation it will still be necessary to borrow an additional $5 billion in the next 4 years?

Soviet troops are already immobilized, particularly in Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and, of course, in Afghanistan. Is it possible that Moscow plans quite dispassionately to station another contingent in Poland? In this country where attacks on horseback were made against Hitler's tanks, we can expect that resistance will be much fiercer than in Czechoslovakia. In August, according to credible witnesses, several "special" units are said to have refused to participate in the repression that certain persons wanted to set in motion. A number of Poles made their testimony available to their Western friends and asked them to take care of their children. Manifestly, as Walesa recalled, the Poles have decided not to allow themselves to be "normalized" without a struggle.

In such a climate, the international atmosphere would lead inevitably to a fantastic takeoff of the arms race, which can be ill supported by the Soviet economy.

Finally, limiting ourselves to the principal chapter headings of the Polish situation, the Kremlin knows that a strike against Poland would also be an almost fatal blow to what remains of the "international Communist movement." How will the activists of the PCF [French Communist Party], PCI [Italian Communist Party] or PCE [Spanish Communist Party] be able to swallow this latest bitter pill? No one believes that Georges Marchais wants such an inglorious action before the presidential election. The PCF would then be in danger of suffering the greatest setback in its history.

All of these elements seriously reinforce the thesis of those who think that the tension observed in the East derives principally from "propaganda." By having their troops maneuver on the Polish border, they explain, the Soviets know that the Americans, thanks to their satellites, will detect them and make this known to the world. Similarly, it has been noted that diplomats from the East recently have done little to conceal their "preoccupation" when they talk with their Western colleagues. From that to talking about brainwashing....

Nothing, however, gives us cause for optimism. Many specialists on Poland now think that Moscow, before paying such a high price, will attempt to promote the taking back in hand of Poland by the Poles. Starting with a reorganization of the army, the security services and, if possible, the Party. Then, at the proper time, we might envisage a show of force and, in the event of a setback, a call for the "fraternal" aid of Warsaw Pact countries. However, to do even that, it will still take a bit of time.

By giving the impression of resigning ourselves to an intervention, we are running the risk of facilitating it. In the final analysis, why is the fate of Poland to be inevitably bad? When we listen to the prophets of doom proclaim that "the Soviets will never accept the situation," we sometimes get the impression that they refuse to envision the appearance of something for which they had not made provision.

CAPTION

It is not perhaps tomorrow that we will see Russian tanks in Warsaw as they suddenly appeared in Prague in August 1968.

8143
CSO: 3100

NORWEGIAN TRADE UNION BODY TO CONTACT SOLIDARITY

LD211427 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 14 Nov 80 p 52

[Report by Trygve Wyller: "Norwegian Trade Union Federation Ready To Meet Walesa"]

[Text] The Norwegian Trade Union Federation (LO) is ready to contact the new independent trade union organization in Poland, Solidarity.

"Within the next week we will be sending a letter in which we will declare our willingness to meet the Polish trade union leaders wherever they wish. If the Poles ask us to come to Warsaw, we are prepared to go," LO international secretary Kaare Sandegren said.

Some 4 to 5 weeks ago the LO received a letter from Lech Walesa, through the Norwegian newspaper KLASSEKAMPEN. Recently the letter has been the basis for relatively comprehensive work within the LO to prepare the ground for possible official contact with Solidarity. After the Polish Supreme Court's recent decision to legalize the new trade union movement the LO decided that the time was ripe for making contact.

The letter from Walesa expressed a desire for recognition and a need for support for printing activities. Kaare Sandegren said that comprehensive economic support is out of the question at present, but that the LO is prepared to discuss everything of interest to the Poles. And this, of course, means that the Norwegian Trade Union Federation does not rule out economic aid to Walesa's organization.

The LO has been in constant contact with the other Scandinavian trade union movements about the matter, which has also been discussed at a closed meeting of the European Trade Union Confederation. The LO has also been in touch with the Norwegian Foreign Ministry, but the letter which the LO will soon be sending to Solidarity is an independent initiative by the LO, Sandegren said.

CSO: 3108

BRIEFS

SWEDISH INVITATION TO SOLIDARITY--The Swedish Trade Union Confederation [LO] has invited the newly formed Polish trade union, Solidarity, to Sweden and LO hopes a visit will take place as soon as possible. In a letter to Solidarity, signed by LO president Gunnar Nilsson, great satisfaction is expressed over the development in Poland which led to Solidarity being give.. the opportunity to continue its activity. [Text] [LD191106 Stockholm International Service in Swedish 1000 GMT 19 Nov 80]

CSO: 3109

SPEECH OF PATRIARCH AT SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND UNITY FRONT CONGRESS

Bucharest BISERICA ORTODOXA ROMANA in Romanian No 1-2, Jan-Feb 80 pp 8-15

[Excerpts of an article by the priest Constantin Stanulet: "The Second Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front"]

[Text] The first month of this year, 1980, marked an especially important event in the life of the entire country - the Second Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front.

Speaking in the plenary session of the proceedings of the Congress, the Very Holy Patriarch Iustin, as a delegate of our Orthodox Church, presented the following speech:

"Distinguished participants at the Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front, I have come here to declare that the true believers and servants of the Romanian Orthodox Church are living, together with the other inhabitants of the country, the aspirations of all Romanian souls to raise the country to ever higher levels from day-to-day, to have liberty, justice and well-being for people all over the world and to have an ever more lasting peace everyday throughout the world."

"We are here to confess our solidarity with each of you, with all the children of our people in the common effort to build a new life in our new country."

"We are taking part in the proceedings of the Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front to prove that we are partners in the goals of your political activities, political meaning to us the carrying out of everything that can contribute to the improvement of the country, the affirmation of our people and the achievement of the legitimate ideals of the people."

"This national story began with the liberation of the country from foreign rule. It has developed along the way at a never-before-encountered rate of achievements in the history of our people. A "predominantly agrarian" and backwards country was transformed, especially in the last 15 years, into a modern industrialized country, and agriculture, the other traditional branch of our economy, is now changing, seeing with our own eyes our once poor fields blossoming with abundance."

"In general, viewed in all its aspects, the country is everyday renewing itself in form and content. Along with the material transformations in the well-being of the people, there are also chnges in the manner of living. A new, socialist style of living is being created in our society."

"The Socialist Unity Front has also made its contribution to all these changes in our life. For that reason, appreciating the contribution that it has been called upon to make in the political life of the country, the proposals of our people's leader to improve the structure and activities of the Front were enthusiastically received. This is so since nothing can be more legitimate and pleasant at the same time for a person aware of the role he must have in society than his direct participation in the analysis and taking of measures to solve the problems personally effecting him, his family and the society in which he works, and effecting the entire country. Precisely for that reason, the investment of all the citizens of our Republic with the role of active participants in the management of public affairs constitutes the meaning of the political event which the people are now conducting through their representatives at the Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front."

"In the movement forward along the path of full democratization of our Romanian society, this event is recorded as the beginning of a new stage in improving the political life of our people. It could now be said that, on one hand, on a vertical plane, we are pursuing the furthering of research into all the problems confronting man today and, on the other hand, on a horizontal plane, we are achieving the involvement of all citizens in an ever greater daily effort to serve the country. In other words, in its new structure, the Front of Socialist Democracy and Unity will makes its contribution to a greater development of the citizens' democratic and patriotic spirit, as well as to strengthening the ties between them and cementing our national unity. Thus renewed and purified, democracy, patriotism and national unity are permanently placed where they fit in well, at the foundation itself of our public life."

"Very honorable congress: Fully integrated in the life of the Romanian people, the Orthodox Church has demonstrated its Romanian conscience, both in the daily life of its faithful and in the great moments of happiness and pain in the history of the country. History tells us that the bishops were constantly alongside the princes, helping them in one way or another: sometimes they were permanent advisors or were sent abroad on missions of great trust. Some bishops were related to the rulers, I am thinking of Musatini or Movilesti. But, what constituted the basis for the support they gave to the princes, beyond their kinship, was the love of their forefathers' land and the conscience to serve the people of which they were a part. A great bishop, one who lived fully both the joys and tragedies of our people during the first half of this century, the bishop of Transylvania, Nicolae Balan, upon hearing of the partitioning of the country by the Dictate of Vienna in August 1940, exclaimed: 'We are not the product of the Treaty of Trianon; our political unity is based upon the fact of continuity and the right of our existence as a nation on this land... Our Church will remain from here on the depository of all the aspirations of the people...' And, this is what we now also say. Our forefathers, however, spoke more clearly and more beautifully. They said: 'The country and the Church are one.'"

Embracing all the facets of life of our people and under the difficult living conditions of our forefathers, the Church was always and everywhere present with its word and its deeds, wherever the need for its help was felt. Where it was dark, it brought light; where there was pain, it brought comfort; when our people were in danger, it gave everything it could."

"For centuries, the churches in the cities and villages, and especially the monasteries, were oases of assistance and centers of culture. There they produced and preserved, unfortunately not always under appropriate conditions, manuscripts, old books, tapistries, embroideries and other different religious objects and related ornaments that numbered in the thousands in the libraries and art museums and houses in-country and abroad."

"The recent measures taken by the top state leadership to protect and use these items, which are part of our national cultural treasure, will show to a greater degree than any time up until now our part of the contribution to the artistic and cultural heritage of humanity. In this regard, separate attention must be given to the books."

"Our old church printing presses for centuries turned out books on religion and religious education, and sometimes secular books, not only for us Romanians, but for other people as well. In this manner, our country produced cultural works for an area much broader than just the Romanian lands."

"The publications in Romanian had an entirely different meaning in the life of our people. The publication and dissemination of church books in Romanian had not only a religious purpose, but also satisfied the needs of all 'Romanian people' to speak the same language. And, the permanent affirmation of the Romanian language throughout all the areas inhabited by Romanians served the unity of our people. Further, recent discoveries of the remains of churches that were built from time to time throughout the centuries in our villages and cities alongside secular buildings and preserved throughout the centuries attest completely to the Romanian continuity in the entire expanse inhabited by Romanians from the oldest times up to our times. Finally, by warmly embracing and enthusiastically supporting the achievement of the great ideals of our people, the Church made and continues to make its contribution to preserving national liberty, independence and sovereignty."

"Greatly esteemed delegates and invited guests, it is well known that right from the day of the liberation of the country, the our Church has pledged to support the carrying out of the great reforms for building a new life in our country. And, later, it welcomed with great joy the establishment of the Socialist Unity Front, since it gave the Church the opportunity to increase its contributions in the area of public activities."

"Now, when this organization is being given a new structure, the faithful and workers of our Church, through my voice, are expressing their full support for the renewal of the Socialist Unity Front, making their pledge and contribution to carrying out all the actions initiated by our state's leadership for improving the country and achieving the ideals of our people."

"Following the example of our forefathers, which combined belief with love for the Romanian lands, prayer with work and natural rights with public duties, we will also try hard, according to the needs of our times, to be part of the effort to build a new Romania, to build a socialist Romania, to build a happy Romania."

"And, for everything that the Church owes to our socialist state, that is, for the legal framework created for it in society, for the real and full freedom that it enjoys, for all the help it enjoys and for the broad understading that it receives from all the authorities in resolving church problems, the church leadership, the clergy and the faithful of the Romanian Orthodox Church give deep thanks, through me, to the top state leadership, giving it all their worth and devotion and their support and cooperation in the development of our dear country, the Socialist Republic of Romania."

"An affectionate word, from our hearts, is appropriate in our address now to the first citizen of country, our much esteemed President Nicolae Ceausescu. A brother of the holy land of our country, he carries in his strong arms the flame of love for the people, a flame which warms the hearts of the millions and millions of people who are building the image of the new Romania, the free and independent Romania, master of its own destiny. The permanent bearer of the flag of peace throughout the world, he everywhere presents the truth that the sole alternative for mankind to survive is peace, and the only way to arrive at this peace is through disarmament. A personality with great prestige throughout the world, people everywhere who seek liberty, justice and well-being turn towards him."

"For that reason, much esteemed President of the Republic, we all value you, we all honor you, we all love you."

We also note that within the framework of the proceedings of the commission to discuss the tasks of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front in promoting and achieving the foreign policy of the party and state, proceedings that involved 355 delegates and invited guests, the Very Holy Bishop of Buzau, Antonie Plamadeala, also spoke.

The national conference of the Organizations of Socialist Democracy and Unity constituted a special section of the Congress.

Within the framework of the conference, the delegates examined diverse aspects of the activities of the organizations they represented, showing the political importance of the new organizational framework created to increase the participation of citizens in the leadership of society.

The delegates at the conference then unanimously elected the Central Committee of the Organizations of Socialist Democracy and Unity, made up of 209 members. Representatives of the Romanian Orthodox Church are also members of this committee, as well as representatives of the other religious groups in our country:

Teofil Herineanu - the archbishop of Cluj; Antim Nica - the archbishop of Tomis and the Lower Danube; Eftimie Luca - the bishop of Roman and Husi; Visarion Astileanu - the bishop of Arad; Emilian Birdas - the bishop of Alba Iulia; Vasile Coman - the bishop of Oradea; Octavian Popescu - the administrative vicar of the Bucharest Orthodox Archiepiscopate; Vitorio Blazutti - the archpriest of the Roman Catholic Church in Bucharest; Pentek Arpad - a professor at the Protestant Theological Institute at Cluj-Napoca; Hans Hermanstadter - the curator of the General Evangelical Church of Augustine Confession in Sibiu; Erdo Janor - vicar of the Unitarian Church in Cluj-Napoca; Regep Sali - iman of the Islamic religion in Bucharest; Constantin Voicu - the rector of the Orthodox Theological Institute in Sibiu; and, Petre Gherghel - provicar general of the Roman Catholic Archiepiscopate in Bucharest.

Carried out under the sign of unity of all the people and in an inspiring atmosphere, the participants at the Second Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front discussed the present and future tasks of the country with ardent patriotism.

The Congress adopted as its program the Directives Regarding the Economic-social Development of Romania During the 1981-1985 Period and the Future Orientations To 1990, as well as the four program-directives dedicated to scientific research and technological development, the introduction of scientific progress in the 1981-1990 period and the principal directions until the year 2000, as well as research and development activities in the field of energy for the 1981-1990 period and the main orientations until the year 2000. It also adopted the program for increasing the standard of living during the 1981-1985 period and for continuing to raise the quality of life, and for the economic-social development of Romania nationwide in the 1981-1985 period.

The Congress approved the report and activities carried out by the National Council of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front, as well as some modifications to the Statute of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front.

They then moved to the election of the president of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front. The delegates unanimously re-elected to the position of president of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Frontthe president of Romania, Mr Nicolae Ceausescu. In expressing the unanimous will of all the delegates at the Congress and all the people, the re-election of Mr Nicolae Ceausescu as president of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front presents to the highest degree the guarantee for uninterrupted progress for the national economy and for improving and managing all social affairs, for the purpose of continual growth of the level of civilization and culture of all workers and consolidation of our national unity and independence.

Likewise, the National Council of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front was elected, composed of 537 members. The following people were elected on behalf of the Romanian Orthodox Church and the other religions: Iustin Moisescu,

patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church; Teoctist Arapasu, bishop of Moldova and Suceava; Nicolae Mladin, bishop of Transylvania; Nicolae Corneanu, bishop of the Banat; Nestor Vornicescu, bishop of Oltenia; Antonie Plamadeala, bishop of Buzau; Vladimir Marcovici, Serbian vicar-bishop of Timisoara; Jakab Antal, auxiliary bishop pf the Roman Catholic Church of Alba Iulia; Francisc Augustin, leader of the Roman Catholic Archiepiscopate in Bucharest; Kernweis Konrad, the Roman Catholic archpriest of Timisoara; Nagy Gyula, bishop of the Reformed Diocese of Cluj-Napoca; Papp Laszlo, bishop of the Reformed Church in Oradea; Albert Klein, bishop of the C. A. Evangelical Church in Sibiu; Paul Szedressy, bishop of the Synod-Presbyterian Evangelical Church (Cluj-Napoca); Lajos Kovacs, bishop of the Unitarian Church (Cluj-Napoca); Moses Rosen, chief rabbi of the Jewish religion; Dirair Mardikian, bishop of the Armenian-Gregorian Bishopric; Mehmet Iakub, chief of the Islamic Church; Chiril Savici Ciprian, bishop-vicar of the Old Rite Christian Church; Cornel Mara, president of the Committee of the Adventist Union; Dumitru Popa, president of the Baptist Union; Pavel Bochian, president of the Council of the Pentacoastal Church; and, Victor Dumitrescu, first-delegate of the Committee of Christianity According to the Gospel Union.

At the proposal of president Nicolae Ceausescu, the Congress decided that the anthem of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front will be the song "Unity Is Written On The Tri-Color Flag."

We can state with complete conviction that the Second Congress of the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front, the broadest and most representative organ of our democracy, through the decisions that it adopted will open new and broad horizons and will more powerfully engage the energies of all the people, firmly involved in building a worthy and prosperous Romania.

Alongside all the sons of the country, our Orthodox Church, which participated with great enthusiasm through its delegates at the proceedings of this great forum, fully expresses its adhesion to the decisions made, continuing to make its pledge and contribution to raising the country to ever higher levels of progress and civilization.

8724
CSO: 2700

REPORT ON SPEECH OF BISHOP AT WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES MEETING

Bucharest BISERICA ORTODOXA ROMANA in Romanian No 1-2, Jan-Feb 80 pp 41-53

[Article by Antonie Plamadeala, bishop of Buzau: "Meeting Between the Leaders of the World Council of Churches and the Representatives of the Member Churches in the Socialist Countries in Eastern Europe (Budapest, 26-31 January 1980)"]

[Text] This was the second meeting of this type convened by the World Council of Churches, with the first also being held in Budapest, in 1977.

At this 1980 meeting, delegates from the churches in Romania also took part: bishop Antonie Plamadeala of Buzau, member in the Central Committee and Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches, and bishop Albert Klein of the C. A. Evangelical Church in Sibiu and member in the Central Committee.

Also present on behalf of the World Council of Churches were:

Archibishop Edward Scott (Anglican Primate of Canada), president; Rev Dr Philip Potter (Methodist Church, from the Dominican Republic), secretary general; Rev Dr Konard Reiser (Evangelical Church, FRG), deputy secretary general; professor Dr Todor Sabev (Orthodox Church in Bulgaria), deputy secretary general.

Present on behalf of the churches in the socialist states in Eastern Europe were:

Professor Jan Anchimiuk (Orthodox Church) from Poland; Rev Alexei Bichkov (Baptist), USSR; Dr Alexei Buevsky (Orthodox), USSR; Archbishop Edgar Hark (Lutheran), Estonia, USSR; Bishop Ivenalie (Orthodox), USSR; Archbishop Kiril (Orthodox), USSR; Archbishop Dr Janis Matulis (Lutheran), USSR; Archbishop Nicolae (Orthodox), Georgia, USSR; Bishop Narek Shakarian (Armenian), Armenia, USSR; Rev Alexei Stoian (Baptist), USSR; Bishop K. Istvan Csete (Reformed), Yugoslavia; Bishop Dorotei (Orthodox Primate), Czechoslovakia; Governor Miroslav Hajek (Lutheran), Czechoslovakia; Bishop Vladislav Kiedron (Lutheran), Czechoslovakia; Bishop Dr Miroslav Novak (Husite), Czechoslovakia; Professor Dr Iosef Smolik (Czech Brotherhood), Czechoslovakia; Bishop Dr Emerich Varga (Reformed), Czechoslovakia; Bishop Dr Iohannes Wilhelm Hempel (Lutheran), FRG; Oberkircenratin Lewek (Lutheran), FRG; Bishop Ratke (Lutheran), FRG; Bishop Dr Tibor Bartha (Reformed), Hungary; Superintendent Dr Foriz Berki (Hungarian Orthodox under the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church, Moscow), Hungary;

Bishop Dr Zoltan Kaldi (Lutheran), Hungary; Rev Ianos Laczkovszki (Baptist), hungary; Priest Teodor Meszaros (Romanian Orthodox vicar), Hungary; Dr Ioseph Nagy (Free Church), Hungary; Professor Dr Karoly Prohle (Lutheran), Hungary; Bishop Dr Karoly Toth (Reformed), Hungary; Professor Totin Koev (Orthodox), Bulgaria; Bishop Pangratie (Orthodox), Bulgaria; and, Rev Zdzislaw Pawlik (Baptist), Poland.

In addition to these, 10 interpretors, 8 from Czechoslovakia and 2 from the USSR, and 12 other representatives from Hungary, as well as observers and organizers also participated. Thus, the total number of participants was 59.

All the participants were housed at a hotel on Margareta Island, and the proceedings took place at the Reformed Collegium in Pest.

The Proceedings

The opening speech, in the name of the Ecumenical Council of the Churches of Hungary, was presented by Dr Tibor Bartha (a Reformed bishop). He spoke about the need for the unity of the Churches in the socialist countries and about the impact of Christian unity upon world unity.

The introductory report was presented by Dr Philip Potter, the secretary general of the World Council of Churches. From his speech, one can especially remember the themes that he suggested for discussion:

-- intensification of relations between the Churches in the East and West (reciprocal visits, new members from the East in the leadership in Geneva);

-- the important contribution of certain churches in the FRG and Hungary at the successful conference in Boston (United States) on "Science, Religion and the Future;"

-- development of relations within the framework of the Bossey Institute, where the Eastern presence is still not satisfactory. The Romanian Orthodox Church was mentioned as an example of positive participation, and a young well-prepared professor from the church will probably be employed.

After hearing this report, more representatives spoke: Dr Tibor Bartha (Hungary), bishop Hempel (FRG), Bishop Iuvenalie (USSR), Bishop Scott (Canada) and so forth.

After these discussions, it was decided to establish a Steering Committee, which, together with the leadership of the World Council of Churches, would set the themes that would continue to be discussed in a systematic manner. At the proposal of Dr Potter, this Committee was composed of the following persons: Bishop Iuvenalie (USSR), Bishop Antonie (Romania), Bishop K. Toth (Hungary), Bishop Pangratie (Bulgaria), professor Smolik (Czechoslovakia), Bishop Hempel (FRG) and pastor Bicikov (USSR).

The first session of the Steering Committee then followed.

In this session, Bishop Iuvenalie (USSR) insisted that everything should revolve around proper preparations for the General Assembly at Vancouver, proposing that by 1983 exchanges of visits should be organized between the Churches of Canada and those in the socialist countries. Bishop Pangratie seconded the motion. Bishop Dr K. Toth, who is also the president of the Christian Conference for Peace in Prague, asked that we establish the specific contribution that the churches in the socialist countries can make in the World Council of Churches. Following Bishop Iuvenalie, he asked for a response to the criticisms brought to the Council and an analysis of the current political context, about which, certainly, the churches in the socialists countries can present their clarifying opinions in the Council and at the future Executive Committee meeting (February, at Strasbourg, France). In the same sense, Bishop Hempel of the FRG spoke, asking that we define the specific reason for our meeting at Budapest as the churches from the socialist countries, and we certainly have something specific to say.

Much was made of this specific reason in the socialist countries, taken as a bloc, trying to arrive at common positions, opinions and statements, in which case each can speak in the name of all and where what is said is binding for all.

At this point, Bishop Antonie Plamadeala of Buzau asked to speak. He pointed out the implications of this means of expression, which did not present exact situations and risked falsifying reality. Certainly, there is a positive aspect of the specific nature of the churches in the socialist countries and, mainly, they can be generally expressed, but there are also some difficulties and even risks in considering this specific nature an overall one.

In also explaining what these difficulties and risks are, Bishop Antonie was asked to present these points of view in the Plenary Session, since it was felt that "they are truly important."

Although group working sessions had been scheduled for the second day that were to deal with the different themes that had been selected by the Steering Committee, it was decided to continue to work in the Plenary Session in order to listen to Bishop Antonie Plamadeala, after which the themes for the working groups were to be determined.

On the second day, Bishop Antonie made a speech, roughly speaking, with the following points:

I. "I spoke last night in the Steering Committee and the Committee proposed, and I happily accepted, to repeat what I said there in order to clarify a problem of principle. In addition to what I said in the Steering Committee, I would like to add some other considerations regarding the content that our meeting ought to have and regarding the themes that would be within its competence, to the same degree in which they would also be within the competence of the World Council of Churches and the leadership that we were invited here to have discussions with."

"The problem of principle that I wish to raise requires that we start right with this invitation. First, however, I want to thank the World Council of Churches, in the name of the Romanian Orthodox Church, for the invitation to this Conference and for the invitation that was sent to us. I would also like to thank our hosts, the Churches of Hungary, for the hospitality that has been offered to us."

"Our presence here, as well as that of the representatives of the churches from all the socialist countries, proves the interest that we have in the World Council of Churches. I think that this is the first thing that we should say to the World Council of Churches: We are all here. And, certainly, we also have something to say. We did not come merely to carry out an act of collective presence."

"Yesterday during the first contacts in the Plenary Session and last night in the Steering Committee, a number of representatives tried to define why, the reason for our meeting as churches only from the socialist countries. Prior to leaving Bucharest, I asked myself very seriously what we would discuss here over 4 days. I realize now that we have several things to discuss, as I said, of principle and they must be clarified well."

"Yesterday in the Plenary Session and last night in the Steering Committee, very many of the delegates mentioned the word specific. They said: We came here to point out the specific situation of our churches in the socialist countries; to point out that we can cooperate specifically with the World Council of Churches, to point out the specific experience that we can bring to the World Council of Churches, and how we wish to be treated according to our specific situation by the World Council of Churches."

"Well, gentlemen, regarding this specific thing, I wish to refer to the following, because things are not as simple as they appear at first glance and because we could stir up implications in a direction that could turn against us and against the ideals of unity that we are pursuing and that the World Council of Churches is pursuing in order to unite all the Christians in the world."

"This specific aspect that we are talking about with regards to the churches in the socialist countries contains a positive aspect, as well as several implications that are, if not negative, in any case difficult and risky. Let us take them one at a time:

1. The first aspect, a positive one, deals with the fact that a certain general specific aspect does actually exist. We, the representatives of the churches that have gathered here at the invitation of the World Council of Churches, come from socialist countries. Our churches exist under specific conditions, under a new form of state government."

"I would like to specify that I will speak from the experiences of the Romanian Orthodox Church and the experiences of the religions in Romania.

"We have here with us Bishop Albert Klein of the C. A. Evangelical Church in Romania, the German Church, who can be a direct witness to the statements I am going to make."

"So we can be understood exactly and not misinterpreted or have what we say inappropriately placed under a question mark, the following must be taken into consideration:

-- that we legally exist, in complete freedom, as an institute recognized and helped by the state. For example, we receive, as we did prior to the war, a portion of our funds from the state and, in many cases (in religious education, for example), all our funds from the state;

-- that freedom of conscience is guaranteed by the Constitution and in deeds;

-- that we practice free and legally everything that our religious Tradition requires of us;

-- that we are developing freely and we are carrying out our Christian mission, within the framework of the laws of the country, being able to practice everything we believe in, and we can publish religious literature and so forth;

-- that we are free to take part within the framework of the religion and other religions, domestically and abroad, within the framework of international religious organizations;

-- that we are free to carry out our duties as Christians unto ourselves, to our faithful, to the world and especially to today's world;

-- that we are free to dedicate ourselves to social service and deaconry;

-- that we are loyal to the country and the people, we respect the laws and we declare our agreement and offer our support to everything that works for good, progress and the happiness of people in Romania and everywhere."

"Well, all of this we are free to do under the specific conditions of our countries, laws and loyalties. I do not think, however, that this separates us from the status of the other churches in other parts of the world. What church is not held to respect the laws of the country in which it exists? Our specific nature lies perhaps merely in the fact that we are close to the concerns of the people for their happiness and that we are closer to the ideals of our people, to whom we feel tied through all our history and existence, as is the case for us orthodox Romanians."

"2. In saying this, I have actually introduced the second aspect of the specific nature of the churches in the socialist countries, which, if well-described and explained, still carries great difficulties and even risks and possible misinterpretations. I will give two of these risks."

"a) We cannot speak solely of a specific nature or a general mode for the churches in the socialist countries. The specific nature is different from one country to another. Each church must speak from the specific nature of the country in which it exists. I speak as a Romanian. And, from the specific nature of the church to which I belong. I speak as an Orthodox Romanian. I speak from the specific situation in Romania. I make no comparison, this is not my concern now, with the situation in other socialist countries. I know how it is in Romania and can present and represent the specific Romanian situation. And, I think that each church must proceed in this manner. We risk, and I want to emphasize this, not expressing ourselves if we speak about a general specific nature, in a bloc. And, again I stress: We must be clear in this regard: there is a particular specific nature according to particular conditions, traditions and history and the specific development of each socialist country, as well as each church. We exist within the framework of this particular specific nature which also defines us in a specific way."

"From this particular specific nature (the expression is nearly tautological, but absolutely necessary), we each come forward with our experience. We can meet with the same thoughts and same desires and we can agree upon certain necessary actions at a given moment, but we do this freely, not because of a general specific nature that would artificially underestimate for us the experience of others or the interests of others. Moreover, we came here to freely express ourselves, under the specific conditions of the churches in the countries to which we belong, and to seek out together solutions for certain problems and cooperation with the World Council of Churches, and, amongst ourselves, within the framework of the Council or on a bilateral basis, if there is need for certain bilateral contacts between some churches."

"That is why and how we can offer our cooperation to the Council. And, the reverse is true. This is exactly how other churches within the Council can make an offer to us. I would like you to remember, first of all, the risk of the undifferentiated specific nature from one socialist country to another which can falsify our positions and through which the Council alone would be put in the position of not dealing with true partners, but with a general mode of existence that in reality did not exist."

"b) And, there is a second rick, more serious than the first."

"There have been and will continue to be questions why the leadership of the World Council of Churches met once in 1977 and for a second time in 1980 only with us, the representatives of the churches in the socialist countries. Are we institutionalizing specific relations? Are we collecting what the churches

"in Eastern Europe want, think, are and pursue? Why? One day, perhaps Mr Potter or Mr Scott or others from the West will ask to have meetings only with the representatives of the churches from socialist countries. And rightly so. Why right will we have to oppose it? But, that day will be the end of the World Council of Churches!"

"The World Council of Churches is not a gathering of Us and You, of the capitalist bloc and the socialist bloc. Romania and other countries long ago proposed and are struggling for the dissolution of political and military blocs. Are we now established in Churches and in the World Council of Churches? Here all the Christians in the world must be We and only We!"

"Dr Potter was saying last night in the Steering Committee that the Council has met with other Christian religious organizations, with the churches in America and that accusations had not appeared. They could appear. Even we could formulate them if they would bring about this aspect of separate meetings with the churches in the capitalist world, as such, just as the meeting with the churches in the socialist countries is structured, as such. It is something else when each church speaks in its name, not in the name of a bloc. I want to point this out. Let us avoid producing such a misinterpretation of our meeting. Certainly, no onw wishes to divide the churches into blocs. We all agree upon this. But, the enemies of the World Council of Churches could easily misinterpret us and it would be a catastrophe for the Council."

"For that reason, we must well define why we have gathered together, how we are expressing ourselves and what we are pursuing. And, we must explain ourselves well. And, here is how:"

"3. We are meeting in order to see together, to investigate together how to better integrate ourselves, with our specific nature and that of each church in each socialist country, into the World Council of Churches, regarded as a whole, as a unified organization of all the Christians in the world, as a place of unity."

"We are meeting as churches from the socialist countries in Eastern Europe, not in order to separate us from the other churches in the world and not in order to place us in contradiction with them, but to integrate ourselves in the same ideals, to tell them what we think of the ideals of our churches and for them to tell us about theirs, and to try to meet them and collaborate for the purpose of building a better world and a more unified Christianity. Let us collaborate more and better. Let us see what we can give the Council from our experience, from each's experience, and let us say what we expect from the Council in order to achieve the ideals and prophesy of Christ, 'That all will be one,' a single, normal being, with two hands and with many hands helping in the same work. Dr Potter said yesterday, in another context of ideas, that in isolation nothing can be done, that one hand cannot applaud. I liked this wise saying. Applause is the sign of happiness, of balance, of life. If we are a single hand, we will not be able to applaud. Nor will we be able to do anything else."

"II. I would now like to try some practical considerations, for reasons of time, selecting them from among many that I have in mind. With regards to what we can give the World Council of Churches and with regards to what we are asking or have already obtained from the Council, I would be tempted to divide my considerations into two areas: those of the future and those of immediate interest."

"1. In the future, let us give the Council our will and desire for Christian unity and human unity at the same time. Let us give equal values to vertical orientations and horizontal orientations. Only in this way will we have credibility in today's world. Only by integrating ourselves in its efforts towards better things. Dr K. Toth pointed out yesterday that the three great Christian faiths think of Christian unity in different ways, and we still do not know if something has been achieved in this regard to date within the framework of the Council. Dr Toth is working especially in the Christian Conference for Peace and it can certainly be noted that the World Council of Churches has also accomplished some things. For example, the mentalities of the people and churches have changed, human closeness has been achieved and formulas for unity have been drawn up, such as 'The Reconciled Community.' It has arrived at an advanced stage with discussions on the document about 'Priesthood, the Eucharist and Baptism.' Extremely important steps have been taken regarding the common implication of the churches in the problems of the contemporary world, and so forth. Certainly, there is also room for more, but something has been done."

"We all came into the World Council of Churches with our local church experience and, expressing these experiences, we offered models to the other churches. I am sure that the experiences of the churches in Romania, for example, are profitable experiences for many churches:

-- We have achieved the equality of all religions, both in the way they deal with each other and in the way they are treated by the state;

-- We hold inter-faith, ecumenical conferences three times each year where we exchange ideas, deal with themes of common interest and reach common, ecumenical points of view. We call this local ecumenism, and we feel the experience is very successful;

-- We succeeded in arriving at a common position regarding the state, for all of us to sincerely declare our loyalty and desire to cooperate with everything that leads to the well-being of the country and, therefore, of our faithful;

-- We give our faithful the complete freedom to express themselves as citizens, with everything that this implies, while the state gives through law the right of conscience to all citizens, with all that this implies;

-- We have six members in parliament (representing five large churches: Orthodox, Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical and Jewish);"

"-- Recently in Romania, an important political organ was reorganized, 'the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front,' and, on 17 January 1980, the second Congress took place. Representatives of all the religions are part of the Front. The 'Front' is an forum open to all citizens, and therefore the religious groups, to take part in the discussion of problems that interest the proper operation of the country. At the Congress, the Very Holy Bishop Iustin spoke and yours truly spoke in the foreign affairs section. The two Romanians present here, Bishop Albert Klein and yours truly, were elected to the National Council of the Front, together with other representatives of the religious groups. We are, therefore, a known reality in public life. We have, as churches, the place and opportunity to speak out and express ourselves in public affairs."

"I think that these things can interest the National Council of Churches. In the Council we are a partner with a voice, at home and here. Certainly, this is so while remaining constantly loyal to our Christian identity to the same degree in which we remain loyal to our Romanian identity."

"This is an experience which we can communicate and which remains for the future in our participation in the affairs of the Council."

"2. But, there are also several things that we have to say about the immediate present, considering them a contribution to the solution of difficulties through which today's world is currently passing."

"I think that all the churches must see the serious moment and near impasse in which the peace of the world has entered. Some references to this have been made here. We must be decisive in recognizing this situation and firmly come out for its most urgent resolution."

"Let us ask for Peace. We have spoken here of a certain Religious Renaissance. Let us impose our religious point of view as a factor of peace, not of tension and war."

"The time has come to select between life and death. In a Council document, it recommends discussions between Marxism and Christianity. I think it is not time now for discussions on theories and confrontations, but for a decisive call for peace. Let us all think together what the churches can do to stop the threat of war, the arms race and military adventures."

"-- The churches, as well as countries, as Romania has systematically done, should come out against force and the threat of force, and demand the solution of litigations through negotiations and diplomacy;"

"-- Should come out for the equality of all countries, large and small, and for their liberty;"

"-- Should come out for the sovereignty and independence of all nations;"

"-- Should come out for non-interference in domestic affairs;"

"-- Should reject interference that can lead to a world catastrophe;"

"-- Should reject any policy of hegemony or division of the world into spheres of influence;"

"-- Should reject any policy of discrimination and racism, for reasons of religion or for any other reason;"

"--Should militate for a new economic and political order in the world, the only way of leading to the radical solution of certain problems such as inequality, lack of resources, hunger, poverty and so forth;"

"-- Should militate for the proper preparations for the Madrid Conference;"

"-- Should struggle together for unity and peace in the world. Especially when peace is threatened and when there is a threat of returning to the cold war and even an actual war."

"I think that these are problems that we should discuss here, we must come out of this meeting with this and ask the World Council of Churches to work in this direction."

"I am convinced that on these grounds we will meet all the churches of the world, from the East and the West. Since we must all unite our efforts in the same direction."

III. This speech by Bishop Antonie Plamadeala had the strength to reorientate completely the Budapest Conference, with all the speakers referring to it.

From this point, there was no further insistance upon bloc policies, and the church representatives all spoke only in the names of the churches in their countries and they all spoke out for peace and negotiations.

IV. One of the problems discussed was the problem of the rights of man and religious freedoms. Allusions were made to cases of violations of these rights, without specifying a single case.

Bishop Antonie also spoke in connection with this subject, pointing out that in Romania there are no cases of violation of religious rights or the rights of man for religious reasons. If among those who are in conflict with the law there is a member of the clergy or one of the faithful, they are not in this situation because of their religious beliefs, but because they are in conflict with the laws of the country.

The religious groups in Romania exist within the framework of the laws and make their contribution in all the works undertaken in the interest of the citizens. We promote the doctrine of the "Social Apostolate" and the "Serving Church"

for the people and society, certainly from our Christian position. This position urges us to also struggle, alongside all people, for liberty, equality, freedom from poverty, freedom from slavery wherever it may be and freedom from discrimination. The new society in Romania has even helped us to rediscover the evangelical vocation, about which the church had forgotten. The churches are not the enemies, but the friends of the world.

The integration of the religious groups in Romania into the new socialist society was accepted by the state and the churches were understood. In this manner, the religious groups were guaranteed all the rights: to exist free, to develop and to preserve and develop their institutions, structures, schools, press and relations between them and international organizations, and a portion of their property, vineyards, houses and churches. Certainly, they were asked to respect the law and to be loyal to the state. The religious groups felt and feel that this request is normal and legal.

Thus, we enjoy complete freedom. No priest is imprisoned for his belief or because he is a priest. No priest is prevented from carrying out his religious services, from preaching the Gospel or writing theology. There are monasteries, seminaries and theological departments for all the faiths, the Bible is published and church and theological books appear.

Our religious and human rights are thus completely respected.

Allusions were made here by the leadership of the World Council of Churches that there are nonetheless cases of violations. With regards to Romania, they do not exist. To be clear, however, I would like here to make several points, in order to guide the World Council of Churches in this regard, because there is need to observe several fine points when one speaks of violations of certain human and religious rights.

If a priest demonstrates against the state and if he happens to be imprisoned, is he locked up for his belief? We do not even have to answer this. It is in itself understood that this is not the case. And, should this be included in the ranks perhaps of those whose human rights have been violated? And, in what country are activities against the state not punished? That this person is also a priest is only a coincidence. Certainly, it does not suit the church that a priest is involved in such activities, but it knows that he was not imprisoned because of his position as a priest or that he is a believer. The church is not considered responsible for the anti-state political activity of one isolated person who is a priest. The church cannot offer him protection, if he is in conflict with the laws of the state. This would mean that the church itself is in conflict with the laws of the state. The Orthodox Church still has, for example, 10,000 priests and other religious groups have approximately 5,000, and they all enjoy freedom in all fields.

The religious groups are interested in all these priests enjoying this freedom. For anti-state political activities, for reasons that are not religious, each individual is responsible. He carries out his politics according to what he thinks,

not according to what the church or his religious group thinks. He has to explain himself, first of all, to the state. The state will rightly say that the individual has violated the rights of the state, not that it, the state, has violated the rights of the individual.

The church must defend the interests of the entire church, and its criteria are its laws and the laws of the state in which it exists.

As long as the state gives the religious groups the right to exist, the believe, to pray, to have institutions and to participate in making decisions in the state, the religious groups have no reason to complain.

We in Romania are thankful to the state because it shows great understanding towards the religious groups. We are thankful to the state because the church can provide each Christian the assistence he needs. We are thankful to the state because it is in no way restrictive regarding the content of our belief, our dogma and our traditions. Thus, we feel that the state respects our religious rights and our human rights. As long as the religious groups can provide any Christian a priest and an open church and as long as the priests can be called to the homes of the believers and can go, we believe that we, the religious groups, are doing our duty and the state is doing its duty. This type of state, and I am referring to Romania here, respects human rights and religious liberties.

My recommendation would now be: If the World Council of Churches wishes to understand this problem the way it should and the way it is in reality, in Romania, for example, it must take into consideration everything that I have said now.

V. Continuing, speeches were made by Bishop K. Toth (Hungary), professor Koev (Bulgaria), Pastor Stoian (USSR), professor I. Anchimiuk (Poland), Bishop Kiril (USSR), Bishop Hempel (FRG), Bishop Dorotei (Czechoslovakia), Dr Potter and Dr Scott (World Council of Churches), with all of them referring positively to Bishop Antonie's speech.

Bishop Albert Klein of the C. A. Evangelical Church in Romania made two speeches. He spoke beautifully about the equality of religious groups in Romania and about their collaboration and the freedoms that they enjoy equally.

VI. The Steering Committee recommended that one of the days there should be a discussion on: "What Did the Ecumenical Meetings in the Socialist Countries Mean for the Churches in These Countries."

Bishop Antonie Plamadeala also made a speech, enumerating the following:

a) The faithful are aware of ecumenism from participating in services and from the speeches of ecumenical visitors;

b) By holding certain meetings in monasteries, ecumenism has also penetrated the monasteries, where this penetration is usually difficult;

c) We have been able to express the church's interest in the world and the problems of today's world, and this orientation was also positively received by the state;

d) In Romania, an Ecumenical Institute will be built, which will test the interest in ecumenism.

VII. In connection with the subject: What Are the Priorities of the Present?, recommended by this same Steering Committee at the suggestion of Bishop Antonie, the Bishop spoke once again in the Plenary Session, summarizing the subject in three points:

1. Let us recognize that the situation is serious. Without dramatizing, let us recognize it dramatically;

2. Let us be in favor of detente and negotiations, for peaceful coexistence and against the cold war and actual war. Let us decisively come out in favor of peace.

3. Let us make a call for peace or issue a communique in which we come out in favor of peace and for the principles that can ensure it. We cannot make such an appeal without being guilty that we hid from the danger during a difficult moment in the life of mankind.

VIII. During the last day of the meeting at Budapest, there was a press conference. Approximately 25 reporters and Hungarian television were present. Among those selected to answer questions was Bishop Antonie Plamadeala. He answered two questions:

1. Question: What was discussed at the meeting in Budapest?

Answer: Although we come from different countries, each with its own specific nature, which was clearly affirmed here, we succeeded in speaking as churches through a single voice regarding the situation in the world today. New came out in favor of peace and the right of nations to liberty, sovereignty and independence. We asked for an end to the use of force or the threat of force, the end of the arms race and the race for hegemony. We pointed out the situations of the churches in our countries in such a way that the World Council of Churches could once again hear, right from us, that we enjoy full rights. I pointed out that in Romania the churches have representatives in parliament and the Socialist Democracy and Unity Front, and can thus participate with full rights in the decisionmaking and management process in the country, alongside all the other citizens. We met in Budapest, we, the representatives of the churches in the socialist countries in the East, at the invitation of the World Council of Churches, not to separate ourselves from the rest of the member churches of the Council, but in order to think together how to integrate ourselves better and more in the Council and to contribute to the efficiency of its actions in today's world.

2. Question: What does the World Council of Churches mean for the Orthodox Churches?

Answer: a) The opportunity to express themselves on a world scale. It has been frequently said that we are outdated churches, left behind everything. We have changed that opinion.

b) We were able to have our say from our experience and our thought as orthodox members and as orthodox members from the socialist countries from which we came upon the unity of the church and on the problems of the contemporary world.

c) In the Council, we were given the opportunity to tell the truth about ourselves, frequently under conditions of a propaganda that falsified the realities in our countries. Today we are finding a change in the mentality of people in this regard.

d) In the Council, we also had the occasion to find out about other churches, exchange ideas, to give and to receive.

e) We were given the opportunity to declare ourselves brothers with all the Christians in the world, pointing out that we are not isolated, because in isolation nothing lasting can be built.

f) Under the special and difficult conditions of political life these days, we had the opportunity to decisively express our word and wich for peace and to ask the Council to make an appeal for peace in the name of all churches.

Bishop Antonie appeared three times on Hungarian television, twice speaking in the Plenary Session and once at the press conference.

The proceedings of the meeting at Budapest concluded with a reception offered by the Ecumenical Council of the Churches of Hungary, chaired by Bishop Tibor Bartha. Also present was the president of the State Office for Religious Problems, Miklos. Meeting with Bishop Antonie, he said that relations between our countries are very good. He had pleasant memories of the visit he made to Romania and sent his greetings to Mr president Ion Rosianu.

At the end of the proceedings at Budapest, a final communique was released to the press, as well as an aide-memoire that will be sent to the churches.

The delegate from the Romanian Orthodox Church, Bishop Antonie Plamadeala, was brought into the final editing commission for these documents.

After he formulated objections to some of the passages that referred to difficulties between the major and minor religious groups and to some non-ecumenical attitudes in the churches from all the socialist countries,

Bishop Antonie stated that such situations do not reflect the reality in Romania, and as such would not be able to sign the document. Either it specifies where such situations exist, if they exist somewhere, or these passages should be withdrawn. They were later eliminated.

It has not been decided if there will be a third such meeting of the churches from the socialist countries in Eastern Europe.

8724
CSO: 2700

EMINESCU DEFENDED AGAINST CHARGES OF XENOPHOBIA, ANTI-SEMITISM

Bucharest ROMANIA LITERARA in Romanian 11 Dec 80 p 8

[Article by Pompiliu Marcea]

[Text] The printing of Eminescu's journalistic work, beginning with Volume 9 of the series of "Works", reflecting the 1870-1877 period, but chiefly focusing on the activity at CURIERUL DE IASI, in 1876-1877, is more than what, as a rule, we designate, with a rather stale formulation, as a cultural event. In our view, it is a matter of an outstandingly important episode of the program for restoring the great Romanian spiritual values. Such an unprecedentedly fecund program was sometimes undermined by errors and pernicious and precarious procedures stemming from a narrow, mechanistic and dilettantish mental attitude, according to which the values of the past ought to literally meet the requirements of the present. This kind of profoundly nondialectical vision, far from the scientific spirit and already combated by Engels in "Anti-Duhring," a ridiculously pragmatic vision, has resulted -- we know it -- in making unusable, especially for a researcher, so many of the republished books that many times we need, in our search for more information on a classical text, to use old editions, which have become increasingly rare,but which also are incomplete. These procedures, which were frequent specifically prior to 1965, primarily resulted from a departure from elementary logics and from the laws of dialectics. For, we know full well, every historical era has its own individuality and structure, ideals and needs, and by no means can we extrapolate or mechanically interblend the eras without making regrettable confusions. Let it be clear, our predecessors did not think for us because they didi not know us, they could not be aware of the problems agitating us in order to give us a "helping hand," their huge merit actually is to have assured our historical continuity. We are indebted to them for our existence today. Assuring our nationhood meant that they did their duty. Accusing them, or even more, reacting by parricide (which happened more than once) meant that wedid not deserve them. If we, in our turn, relay to future generations the message of a free and dignified people, we do our duty. For, Eminescu wrote in August 1870, "if a generation can have a merit, it is that of being a faithful agent of history, of carrying the tasks necessitated by the place which it occupies in the chain of times." And if our precursors did not think for us in terms of their not being able to take up our today's assignments because they had to

take up those of their era, it means that, rationally speaking, we cannot give them lessons, because of the very principle of history's irreversibility, but in taking over their heritage we examine it lucidly and critically, in light of the new horizons of knowledge and the tasks of the period. The only honest and logical attitude in terms of the past — when it involves its authentic values -- is faithful and unwarped recording. In order for us to have an exact and scientific knowledge of our past we need its exact and scientific picture. A period creates the values which it deems right while, certainly, keeping from the past what is of use to it (and the perennial values are of constant use to it) but it cannot impose to the past values other than those which it produced, as a result of the characteristic of the period, of the brilliant minds and talents asserted, and so on. Therefore, there is not or there cannot be a discipline which is more detached, more sure in its action, than history, of course written scientifically and objectively and examined analytically. For the past is gone, it can by no means scare us unless we are superstitious, like primitives who are afraid of ghosts.

The impressive volume of journalism, which chronologically, by 1877, provides the full texts of Eminescu's journalistic work, arouses profound satisfaction, a reason for which we must pay our full homage and express our gratitude to the era in which we live, thanks to which we have rediscovered our own identity.

In characterizing Eminescu's journalistic work I would state that the chief lesson which it provides is the organic symbiosis between poetical inspiration and journalistic activity. The fact that Eminescu's work feeds on the substance of the time in which he lived as a participant in its great ideals and events is eloquent. Knowing him well. we cannot even imagine the brilliant poet in the stance of wait-and-see, of arrogant indifference, of passivity, of sterile reclusion in the ivory tower or in the gossipy and inefficient cafe.

A descendent of the chroniclers, warriors and scholars, of the 1848 fighters on barricades and enlighteners of the people, of Balcescu whom he venerates, our national poet continues and solidifies by the prestige of his genius a characteristic category of the Romanian creator of spiritual values. He was not reluctant to deal in the modest CURIER DE IASI with the most "down to earth" matters which the spark of his genius enlivened and through temperament and expression marked with the seal of immortality. The sublime and generous soul of the poet, willing to ignore himself, his unique ability to live with maximum intensity the issues of the time and pass judgment on them, the philosophical-theoretical abilities of his mind, his encyclopedic culture, the inimitable vigor of the words, all these virtues and many others that inevitably we omit, equally lively and intensely pervade the poetic text and the journalistic material, interacting to such an extent that we realize that they are congeneric, that they make up a unit of the poet's personality. Let us listen to him: "Hidden in each century in the life of a people is the complex of thoughts that make up their ideal, the same as hidden in the core of the acorn is the idea of the whole oak. Moreover, is it not that all the great men of Romania, more or less clearly, pursue a golden dream

which in essence is identical in all of them and in all times? The twilight of a vanished past, through the darkness of centuries, threw its finest rays and we, the agents of a future world, only are its reflection."

The poet who at the age of 21 in 1871 was deeply involved in the events of the time, does not claim any personal merit but, as a noble mind, regards himself as an exponent, his ideas and views can be a factor only if they are representative. The following passage written by the man who had organized the Putna celebration with enormous difficulties but with invincible patriotic devotion, seems to me, more than a century later, fraught with the same sublime human substance: "If the celebration honoring Stephan will have significance, this will be another proof that it was part of the Romanian people's soul and that it was realized because it had to be realized. However, if it goes unnoticed it will be a proof that it was the expression of individual wills which did not grow from the core of the ideas of the present. It is an axiom of history that all that is right is the outcome of collective thinking and all that is wrong is the product of individual thinking. Therefore, our merit will consist only in formulating the existing ideas and needs of the people, not in creating others. We will be guided by the ideas and needs of our people, not by our own, perhaps received from foreigners, we will be guided by the stream of the ideas of the nation and we will not claim to be the guides, through our individual ideas." These words make Eminescu not only the greatest poet but, equally, a profound social thinker of his time who, through his enlightenment, still impacts on posterity.

A success of the cultural policy of our socialist state involves the fact that the great values which promoted and continue to promote our knowledge and spiritual progress, in this case Eminescu, are scientifically published and become absolutely indispensable research tools. It is known that all cultures have such reference editions, so-called opera omnia, for the great writers. They have not only one, but in very many cases, several. Volume 9 of Eminescu's "Works" demonstrates that our culture too can rank among the cultures which are worthy of their values. We avail ourselves of the Marxist research method, whose soundness and effectiveness have been universally confirmed. Its chief virtue involves the fact that while using the texts of the past without subjective or situational distortions (as done, for instance, by [illegible] Cuza, who selected from Eminescu what fitted with his reactionary id[illegible] causing grave prejudice to the poet, prejudice which lasted for a while) it provides them in the context of the epoch, in the complexity of the objective or subjective historical factors, lucidly and scientifically explaining the universe of the ideas which are characteristic of that period, the historical ambience and context. The readers (as a rule, few in number because the reference editions are meant for experts) are ready to judge the facts with full knowledge of the case and objectivity, as they are provided with the tools needed for an accurate appraisal of the facts. Undoubtedly, the fact that during one period (specifically we have in mind the period prior to 1965) this approach, the only scientific one, was superseded by the procedure of tampering with and distortion of texts, which obviously harmed research, involves a past stage.

Predictably, because of the complex problems of the epoch (explained analytically, in detail and precisely in the introductory study and the system of notes and comments) Eminescu's journalistic work might trigger, if we extrapolate in a nondialectical and non-Marxist manner the current way of thinking into past periods, specific issues, as it often happened 30 years back when dogmatism was the current mode of intellectual reaction. Words or sentences were picked out of context, an entire theory was set forth on the basis of these words and sentences, and in this manner cardinal values (including Eminescu) were rejected. We know well how many writers suffered in those days. The evolution of research, the maturing of thought, the utilization of Marxism in its authentic spirit, free from damaging distortions, under all aspects, have made possible a new stage in putting the cultural heritage to good use. One of the theses that gained ground and moreover had been taken over ad litteram from the liberal bourgeoisie and was violently attacked by Eminescu, involved the so-called xenophobia of the journalist poet who, in the heat of some polemics, directed his causticity against all potentates, against the "ruling section," regardless of the ethnic origin of the opponents. Very many liberals, many sons of Moldavian peasants or freholder landowners originally, were "executed" by the scathing words of the poet. The xenophobia which was attributed to the poet is one of the most infamous slanders, as if designed to desecrate the human stature of the greatest moral intransigence in our culture. Because Eminescu, a superior mind, also conversant with Karl Marx, had on the national question a social and not a racial attitude. The man who was reputed to spend his last income on "ghete and haine" [Romanian words for shoes and clothes] (that is Goethe and Heine), because his shoes and clothes were the same for many years and were paid for with money from old Eminovici, who was one of the admirers of Spinoza and Montaigne and highly valued scholars like Moses Gaster or Heimann Tiktin (who, in his turn, praised the poet), could not be a xenophobe. In Volume 9 which we are surveying, seven notes and announcements focus on violinist Toma Micher, Eminescu's friend and also well acquainted with Slavici, as follows from his correspondence. Eminescu warmly recommended him to Maiorescu for help in his carrer. "I would not say," the poet wrote, "that the young man who will bring this letter is a Rubinstein. I say that the germs of a talent similar to that of the aforementioned also is potential in Mr. Toma Micher. Not in my view... but in the view of his very teachers at the Vienna Conservatory" (Eminescu had met him there, in the group of young Moldavians). Moreover, we know that the poet was in love with one of the Micher sisters.

Nobody more than Eminescu valued the merits of the mind and of talent, of work and honesty. The theory of "ruling sections" from which the charge of xenophobia stems, is based on economic and ethical criteria and never racial criteria. Eminescu was a noble soul, a superior mind, that could not indulge in rudimentary violence. He branded the misleaders, of any nation, including Romanian misleaders, he defended the downtrodden, regardless of their ethnic origin, he praised the deserving, regardless of their origin. He always sided with the poor, Romanians or foreigners, and detested the oppressors, and adopted a class and not racial position. In the article "Mistreatment," the poet is angered and protests against a hooligan

action against a Jewish used book dealer in Iasi. In his article "It Is Rumored That in the Council...." he is proud of the fact that the nation to which he belongs has always displayed comprehension and tolerance in history: "No other nation in the world has more right to request respect than the Romanians, because none are more tolerant than they are... Armenians, Calvinists, Protestants, Jews, all are here and can tell if Romanian governments banned any Armenian, Protestant or Jewish church or school. Not one." In another article, things are equally clear: "He who knows how far we are from hating the Jews -- and this can be understood by any clear-sighted person -- will see that in all our restrictive measures only fair judgment and the instinct of self-preservation have solely played the main role." An obituary praises the generosity of a Jewish woman, a review speaks admiringly of the Polish violinist and composer Gustav Friemann and his repertory, from Mendelsohn-Bartholdy, Spohr, and so forth. All these texts are contained in full in Volume 9 of "Works," issued by the Academy Publishing House. We are not expanding the discussion, especially because the charge of xenophobia levelled against Eminescu by those who only know the poet's theses by ear was masterly shattered by the greatest expert on Eminescu, G. Calinescu, as early as almost half a century ago, in "Theoretical Philosophy" and "Practical Philosophy" from "Eminescu's Work." Resuming the matter in the caricatural and aberant forms of the Liberal Party of the time or of the 30s seems to me at least ridiculous. We do not see a reason for blaming the poet because he was endorsed by some right-wing groups. But he also was endorsed, and this goes to its credit, by the socialist movement. Any tutelary spirit may have a proliferant destiny.

Of course our "contesting" review cannot plan a detailed description of the volume's structure, of the philological or historical-literary criteria that underlay the reproduction of the texts, the thematic classification of Eminescu's journalistic work, a dialog with the prefacer A. Oprea, who provides a relevant study on this activity of our great national poet, and so on. We limit ourselves to stressing that this Volume 9 of "Works" in all respects displays the caliber of Perpessicius' concept and partial realization in his colossal effort of assembling Eminescu's writings and also is by far superior to the prior similar collections, in terms of amount of the material and philological accuracy and historical-literary commentaries. The merits of the authors who prepared the volume are those of outstanding researchers and publishers: Petru Cretia (determining the text and variants and coordination), Dimitrie Vatamaniuc (comments and notes of literary history), Anca Costa-Foru and Eugenia Oprescu (deciphering and literary transcription of texts), G. Busuioceanu, Georgeta Miran and C. Jalba (editors). A huge effort was made because Eminescu, apart from articles, reviews and literary studies, wrote hundreds of items on domestic or foreign policy, on inter-European relations, laws, ethics and political economy, church or education, libraries and cultural events, and more than once there was the need for consulting the foreign press, chiefly German publications, of the period, a procedure which is very difficult, specifically in the context of these very old collections being frayed, incomplete, scattered, and so forth. Only attributing Eminescu's paternity over so many articles and notes required a long and exhausting investigation, especially because ownership in the press in those

days had aspects that were different from what they are today. We provided these details in order to again emphasize that this area involves exhausting top-caliber efforts which only those who never made them cannot understand and appreciate. We also wished to state that we have outstanding editors, passionately dedicated to their profession, capable of devoting all their intellectual energy to the cause of disseminating our great values and that it is only up to us to utilize their entire ability and devotion to the benefit of Romanian culture, for its full assertion, to match its inputs into the everlasting treasure of the world's nations.

11710
CSO: 2700

CONTRACEPTION, STERILITY PROBLEMS HANDLED BY BUCHAREST CENTER

Bucharest FLACARA in Romanian 25 Dec 80 p 13

[Article by Liviu Timbus: "Notes on the Activity of the Center for Combating Sterility and Infertility, for Contraception, Genetic Counselling and Colposcopy"]

[Excerpts] Despite the exceptional results achieved in combating sterility and infertility and despite its studies and research of general interest, the Center for Combating Sterility and Infertility and for Contraception, Genetic Counselling and Colposcopy is insufficiently known not only by the general public but also by specialists in the field.

Affiliated to the Filantropia Clinical Hospital and created on the initiative of an active and enthusiastic collective of obstetricians and gynecologists headed by lecturer Dr Ion Lemnete, the center is located at Calea Victoriei 178. The center has a service for diagnosing and treating sterility and infertility in men and women. The treatment takes place either on an out-patient basis or in a special section of the Filantropia Clinical Hospital. About 1,000 babies are born each year in the hospital to parents who have received treatment at the clinic.

The center has a gynecological department for children, for the purpose of discovering gynecological disturbances and infections in girls under 16 years of age. The genetic counselling department aims at identifying chromosome abnormalities which might have serious consequences for the progeny of the couple. Unfortunately, the approval of the health directorate of Bucharest Municipality is required befor this activity can become official and this approval has not yet been given.

Extensive studies and experimentation work have been carried out in connection with the activity of contraception. A wide range of contraceptives produced in a number of European countries have been utilized for this purpose. At the present time, as a result of the solicitude of the center, some 2,600 women from Bucharest and the provinces are being treated with synthetic progestatives. This is a very small number when we realize that last year 211,788 therapeutic and legal abortions were performed in the country and 144,000 of these were on women with four children. All of these abortions or the majority of them could have been avoided if contraceptive treatment were expanded. Unfortunately, according to lecturer Dr Ion Lemnete, the director of the Filantropia Clinical Hospital,

the territorial commissions which grant approval for abortions are always forgetting that these undesired surgical operations can be avoided if the women are instructed in the use of contraceptives. Contraceptives cannot be used in a haphazard way but only on the basis of preliminary tests to determine what type of contraceptive is best and this is the procedure in the contraception department of the center. Nevertheless--we repeat--only 2,600 women are benefiting from this method which does not have the risks of surgical abortions.

Finally, the collective which established the medical center on Calea Victoriei had in mind the creation of a department dealing with sociological investigations and studies on sex education and the training of young people for family life.

As a result of its complex nature and the way it is structured, which allows continuing collaboration between the consultation departments and its other sectors (laboratory, radiology, pathological anatomy, the genetic counselling department and the in-patient area of the hospital), the center is the only one of this type in the country. It is struggling almost alone for the unravelling and solution of extremely sensitive and difficult problems. The fact that it is still little known to the general public (who can make use of its services without any special recommendations or referrals) represents an additional handicap--a handicap which we have tried to reduce by our modest contribution.

CSO: 2700

EDITORIAL NOTES 'PASSIVENESS' IN LCY DESPITE LARGE MEMBERSHIP

Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 19 Dec 80 p 2

[Excerpt] There is no argument over the fact that today we have in many ways a new League of Communists which operates under considerably changed conditions. Today the LC has the most members it has ever had (over 2 million), which to a considerable extent affects also its total activity.

But there are quite a few empty [useless] moves, silence, and waiting for someone else to solve things. It is indisputable that the essential reason for this passivity is very widespread opportunism which has deep roots. This is most frequently the result of unself-management democratic relations in the LC and in society, fear of a powerful person, to whose weaknesses one points and with whose viewpoints disagreement is brought out. Because of this, there are not a few people in the League of Communists who withdraw into their "little house," justifying this with the explanation: "Why should I involve myself here, and try to do the impossible when I see that the others who did this [i.e., tried] fared badly." There are also LC members who, as was recently said in a BORBA survey, "act in a self-management way" only until they solve some of their problems, get a good job, or an apartment, etc, and then they usually say: "We have struggled enough, now let others do it."

Analyses show that most of the passivity is in areas where there are no democratic self-management relations. In such areas passivity arises also because of the fact that LC organizations largely link their action to the functions of managers and their viewpoints. This reduces the [LC] organization and its members to executors of already enacted requirements, which contributes toward inaction and a wait-and-see attitude; because in these cases all the more important decisions (and not only the more important ones) are organized in advance in small groups, which then try to impose them [on others] as "Party policy."

There are also quite a few organizations which are not in the center of the struggle for the new, for development of self-management, and for the policy of stabilization. They have no insight into the real attitude of the people or the economic situation in their area. They are separated from the vital questions of the working people of their area, from that which is of interest to the workers and which is the reason for their dissatisfaction. Under such conditions, while a great deal is going on in collectives, and decisive action is required against inconsistencies or the usurpation of self-management, the LC organization is occupied with "its own," essentially formal, discussions.

All this raises the need to ask in every area to what extent the membership, organization, and forums of the LC are capable in the every-day activity of workers, in the delegate assemblies, of fighting for the solution of questions, for activating the exceptional potential of our self-management political system, for realizing the policy of stabilization, as this was formulated at the 13th and 15th meetings of the LCY Central Committee.

CSO: 2800

BRIEFS

LCY ELECTIONS--The past election action in basic LC organizations...which took place from June 1979 to March 1980 elected 297,224 members and secretaries of secretariats of these organizations, 193,150, or 65 percent, of whom were elected for the first time; 58,231 were elected as secretaries of whom 38,137, or 65.5 percent, were elected for the first time. Of the total number of 238,993 members of secretariats, excluding the secretaries, 155,013, or 64.9 percent, were elected for the first time. In the past 2 years more than 13,000 new basic LC organizations have been formed, largely in basic organizations of associated work and in rural areas. In the same period almost one-half a million new members were accepted into the LC so that now there are over 2 million communists organized into 62,700 basic organizations. The percentage of workers in secretariates of basic LC organizations is higher (namely, 32.9 percent) than their percentage in the LC as a whole (which is 29.5 percent). Of the new secretaries, 6.6 percent are private farmers, while 6.5 percent of the members of the basic LC organization secretariats are private farmers. [Excerpts] [Belgrade KOMUNIST in Serbo-Croatian 12 Dec 80 p 3]

ARREST OF PLANT DIRECTORS--As part of the criminal proceedings opened against responsible persons in the "Jadral" (Adriatic Aluminum) work organization in Obrovac [Croatia], Janko Jokic, general director of "Jadral" has been under arrest since Monday [24 Nov 80], under suspicion of theft. As is known, Dusan Dilic, former director of the financial-accounting section of "Jadral," has been in prison for the same reasons, as well as Florijan Belamaric, director of "Jadral's" alumina plant, who is suspected of unscrupulous business operations. They are suspected of using contacts and agreements with other persons in the country and abroad for dinar and monetary transactions which imposed damage on the enterprise and procured illegal property benefit for themselves. They made agreements on fictive business with various factories abroad and on the basis of which they were paid for work they had not carried or which had been carried out at considerably less value. Belamaric is suspected of taking over facilities at the alumina plant without a responsible commission and signing a protocol to carry out work, although there was a lack of equipment. At the same time an investigation has been going on in Zadar and Zagreb; three persons employed in the Zagreb "Monting" enterprise and one person employed at the "Jugosanitarija" work organization have been in prison. This last organization has represented "Jadral" abroad and, through "Monting," money was paid into business deals abroad. [Excerpts] [Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 26 Nov 80 p 14]

OUSTER OF INSTITUTE HEADS--The council of associated work in the Dubrovnik Opstina Assembly resolved on Thursday [18 Dec 80] to take temporary measures to protect self-management rights and social ownership at the Institute for Construction in Dubrovnik. On the basis of this resolution, the workers council at the Institute was dissolved and six persons removed from management positions. The opstina LC committee which analyzed the situation issued a judgment on individual responsibility of LC members for the intolerable situation in this work organization and in the housing-communal field in general. Ivo Rokovic, the social defense attorney for self-management, proposed temporary measures and his proposal supported the presidium of the opstina trade union council. The Institute seriously violated self-management rights of workers by not respecting the rules on distributing funds for personal incomes. This rule said that the workers council issues assessments on the results of the work of individual sectors and their supervisors, while assemblies of workers issue assessments for all other employees. However, since mid-1979 the Institute's organs of self-management and supervisors supported the ruling only formally, so that the same (i.e., the highest) assessments of work were issued for all workers. But since neither work plans for individual sectors nor the annual development plan for the Institute had been enacted, on the basis of which work tasks could be monitored, the most essential conditions for distributing personal income funds based on work results were not met. The result of all this was serious deterioration in inter-personal relations. Workers who were valued got practically the same income as those who worked very little. The Institute illegally performed work without concluding a contract or agreement. The technical director of the Institute independently issued decisions on placing workers, without a decision being made by the authorized organs. [Summary] [Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 19 Dec 80 p 14]

CSO: 2800

END

END OF FICHE DATE FILMED

Feb. 2 1981